

ANCIENT LANGUAGES OF THE BALKANS

by

RADOSLAV KATIČIĆ

Part one

1976

MOUTON

THE HAGUE • PARIS

© Copyright 1976 in The Netherlands.
Mouton & Co. N.V., Publishers, The Hague.

No part of this book may be translated or reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publishers.

Printed in Hungary

PREFACE

In a short introductory outline such as the present one it is impossible to handle a complex and delicate subject in any exhaustive and balanced manner. The presentation will always be eclectic and must thus remain the responsibility of the author.

In this survey, the selection of data and of scholarly opinions that are treated at some length is the result of personal experience with the field of study. In some way, it is the book the author wishes he could have had at his disposal when, eleven years ago, he began the study of the languages of the ancient Balkans. This is the spirit in which he would like it to be accepted. Another person's presentation would be different. It cannot be otherwise in a field in which the body of universally shared opinions and received doctrines is small and the approaches of those concerned with it vary considerably. More space has been given to the literary sources than one would expect in such a series; however, for this subject it was vital to provide the appropriate philological and historical basis.

The bibliography, too, is selective, and here again a personal note could not be avoided. The list includes those works which were judged to be fundamental in the field and also those which contain some data or opinions relevant for the course of the main presentation. All authors are quoted in the text and thus connected with some topics in the survey. Some titles occur only in the bibliography without reference in the text. They have no special bearing on any

one of the subjects treated there, but are proposed as useful additional reading.

Finally, I want to express my cordial thanks to Professor W. Winter, the editor of this series, for his interest in my Balkanic studies and to all colleagues who have helped me in my work by sending me their publications. Among them I am most obliged to G. Alföldy, M. Budimir, E. Çabej and the State University of Tirana, I. Duridanov, V. Georgiev, L. A. Gindin, O. Haas, D. A. Hester, H. Krahe, W. Merlingen, F. Papazoglu, G. B. Pellegrini, A. L. Prosdocimi, D. Rendić-Miočević, M. Suić, J. Untermann and K. Vlahov. My sincerest thanks are due to them, because without their help my work would have been much more difficult. Thanks are also due to the French School of Archaeology in Athens where I was, summer after summer, given full opportunities of work in the rich library.

Another debt of gratitude is to the Linguistic Circle of Zagreb where all the subjects concerned with the linguistic past of the Balkan met with much interest and aroused fruitful discussions which helped the author to arrive at clearer ideas about many of the topics discussed in this book.

Thanks are due to Swantje Koch who spared no efforts to bring the bibliography up to the high standard of this series, and to Mate Križman who prepared the indexes.

Zagreb, January 1971

RADOSLAV KATIČIĆ

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	5
1 Introduction	9
2 Pre-Greek	16
2.1 The Greek historical records	16
2.2 The historical setting	27
2.3 The Pre-Greek linguistic stratum	39
2.3.1 Opinions as to the affiliations of the ancient languages of Asia Minor	39
2.3.2 The language indicated by Pre-Greek suffixes	
2.3.3 Non-Indo-European substratum words in the Eastern Mediterranean	55
2.3.4 " <i>Protindogermanisch</i> "	57
2.3.5 Pelastic	63
2.3.6 Pelasgian	71
2.3.7 Anatolian	87
2.3.8 Preserved texts	95
2.3.9 Aegean and Mediterranean	96
3 The northern border area	98
3.0 Introduction	98
3.1 Macedonia	100
3.2 Paeonia	116
3.3 Epirus	120

4. The Thracian complex	128
4.1 Geographic and historical background	128
4.2 The language	137
5. The Illyrian complex	154
5.1 Historical and geographical background	154
5.2 The language	165
5.3 Recent studies in Illyrian anthroponymy	178
5.4 The origin of Albanian	184
6. Bibliography	189

1 INTRODUCTION

The subject of this survey are the languages that in ancient times were spoken on the Balkan Peninsula and now are known only from indirect sources while their texts are lost, completely and irretrievably, or nearly so. In German, such languages are very appropriately called *Restsprachen*. Their study is an unrewarding undertaking since it requires a sharp and painstakingly elaborate methodology which even in the most favorable cases can yield only meagre results. The intricacies of such research are in no way proportionate to the progress in knowledge it promises and, were it not for the inherent importance and interest of the subject, one would be tempted to leave it alone altogether for lack of sources.

And yet, such an attitude is unacceptable because the available data about the lost languages of the ancient Balkans are of the greatest interest to all students of the various and important languages of that area. No history of either Greek or a South-Slavic language, of Albanian or Rumanian can be conceived without an introductory chapter containing the essential information about the languages which existed earlier in the respective areas and with which they established their first contacts there.

It is impossible to speak about Greek without elucidating, as well as possible, its relation to the Pre-Greek linguistic stratum in the Aegean. The same holds true for Albanian or Serbo-Croatian and Illyrian, for Bulgarian and Thracian, and for Rumanian and Dacian. It is mainly for such reasons that the study of the lost languages

of the ancient Balkans remains an important field of linguistic research and cannot be left for enthusiasts and amateurs to play with it, who are fascinated by the thrill of lifting the veil of mystery from the awe-inspiring depths of a remote past which for some reason or other has aroused their curiosity.

Since the beginning of its history, the Balkan Peninsula has been very complex and extremely interesting from the linguistic point of view. The sources, as scarce as they may be, show beyond the slightest doubt that from the oldest times it was an area of great linguistic diversity in which a variety of different languages has always been in close contact. In this respect, the picture has not changed till the present day. Unity in diversity, and affinity irrespective of cognation have remained outstanding features of the linguistic picture of the peninsula.

In order to understand the linguistic variety of the Balkans and the distribution of its languages in ancient and modern times, it is necessary to have at least some general notions of the geomorphology of that part of Europe.¹

The Mediterranean coast of the continent protrudes into the sea, forming three peninsulas that are all clearly distinct from one another. The westernmost, called *Pyrenean* or *Iberic*, is a continental block with Mediterranean and Oceanic influences only in the coastal regions. The middle one, called *Apennine* or *Italic*, is completely exposed to the all-pervading influence of the mild Mediterranean Sea. Both peninsulas have one thing in common: sharply drawn mountain ranges, the Pyrenees and the Alps respectively, separate them from the rest of continental Europe.

The third and easternmost peninsula, divided only by the Straits from Asia Minor, is a continental block too, open to Mediterranean influences only on the coasts and in its extreme south, where a rich and manifold articulation of the narrow mainland and the many islands allow the mild climate of the sea to pervade the whole of the country.

¹ Cf. for what follows CVIJIĆ (1918, 1902) and ROGLIĆ (1970).

However, this eastern peninsula contrasts with the other two in having no clear-cut boundary with continental Europe. Its mountain ranges are connected with an orographic system that extends over a wide continental area: it reaches the southern boundary of the Pannonian Plains, situated in Central Europe, and is closely linked with the Alps in the west and the Carpathians in the east. On both sides of that orographic system, the Mediterranean Sea enters deeply into the continent, thus forming two mighty gulfs: the Adriatic and the Black Sea. The mountainous block is therefore on two sides bounded by the shores of the Mediterranean and is regarded as forming part of the southeastern peninsula whose continental bulk thus becomes very considerable. This peninsula was, like the other two, named after a mountain range, the Stara Planina in northern Bulgaria whose Turkish name is *Balkan* 'mountain'.

The northern boundary of this huge portion of our continent is formed quite naturally by two mighty rivers: by the Sava, from its head-waters in the Alps, near the Gulf of Trieste, to its junction with the Danube, under the hill on which the fortress of Belgrade rises over the Pannonian Plain, and by the Danube from here on, to the point where it empties into the Black Sea. These rivers were no serious obstacle to the movements of men and have never in history been a lasting cultural or linguistic boundary. The easternmost peninsula has always been open towards continental Europe and engaged with it in a permanent exchange of populations and various influences.

The peninsular character of the country south of the Sava – Danube line becomes, however, questionable if one takes into account the fact that the distance from Trieste to the delta of the Danube is bigger than that from the same city to Amsterdam. That means that continental western Europe is more of a peninsula than what is commonly considered to be the northern part of its south-eastern extension.

All these inconsistencies are a consequence of regarding Europe to be a separate continent, different from Asia, instead of describing it as a peninsula of the latter. If viewed in that way, the mountainous

country to the south of the Sava and of the Danube becomes a part of the most continental portion of the European Peninsula, while only the mainland protruding south of the Dardanelles in the east and the Strait of Otranto in the west can be regarded as a real peninsular extension in the eastern Mediterranean.²

We shall now leave to geographers the further discussion of these alternative morphological models. The possibility of such alternative interpretations is what counts most for our understanding of the nature of the area with which we shall be concerned in this survey. This area is composed of two parts: one southern and Mediterranean, the other northern and continental. Although deeply different, these parts are connected by all sorts of historical, cultural, and linguistic links. Very important was the presence and influence of Byzantium in the Middle Ages and the Turkish domination for about five centuries in the beginning of modern times. The Sava and the Danube were easily accepted as the northern boundary of the Balkan Peninsula since for many years they had been the border of Turkey in Europe. Military and political power have thus made them a dividing line which by their mere geographic nature they would never have been. In fact, it is this cultural and political background that has made acceptable the view according to which the whole area is a geographic entity, just as the middle and the western peninsula of southern Europe are.

In fact, the lasting Turkish domination of the country south of the Danube and the Sava cannot be regarded as the result of pure chance since that region is an area of transition between Central Europe and Asia Minor. It is therefore open to influences and pressures from both sides. Such was the position of this area throughout the whole of its history.

² This is a view, expressed already in ancient geography. Cf. Plinius Nat. hist. 4.1: *Tertius Europae sinus Acroceramiis incipit montibus, finitur Hellesponto, amplectitur praeter minores sinus XIX-XXV passuum. in eo Epirus, Acarnania, Aetolia, Phocis, Locris, Achaia, Messenia, Laconica, Argolis, Megaris, Attice, Boeotia iterumque ab alio mari eadem Phocis et Locris, Doris, Phthiotis, Thes-salia, Magnesia, Macedonia, Thracia. omnis Graeciae fabulositas sicut et litterarum claritas ex hoc primum sinu effulsit, quapropter paulum in eo conmorabimur.*

The nature of the southern Balkanic zone is quite Eurasian. It is open to the sea which is easily navigable from one island of the Archipelago to the other and connects the mainland with Asia Minor and the Middle East on one side and over the Strait of Otranto with Italy and Sicily on the other. The main streams of traffic circulate over these "wet paths", as Homer says,³ whereas the continental block remains remote from this southern world. To the dwellers of the Aegean area its very nearness and intimate affinity seem in some way unconvincing and unreal. They feel the continental block to be essentially foreign and different, and yet they cannot ignore the close contacts and fundamental relatedness by which they are linked with it and which impress them again and again. These affinities are the outcome of permanent traffic of a less spectacular kind on the mainland roads that followed the river-valleys and crossed the mountain-passes of the continental block. On these tracks, the superior culture of the Aegean area penetrated the northern country, and northern influences made themselves felt in the south.

The continental block strikes its observer with two conflicting characteristics: communicative permeability, and isolation. In the north, the plains are quite open towards Central Europe, the shores of the Adriatic and of the Black Sea are easily accessible to navigation. Especially the islands and straits of the Adriatic link the Balkans intimately with Italy. Yet, in the central mountainous part of the continental block the opposite characteristic of isolation strongly prevails, preserving and perpetuating in these highlands a most conservative and patriarchal outlook and way of life. In all peripheral parts of the block the communication with the adjacent non-Balkan areas has been easier and more frequent than with other regions inside the Balkans.

And yet, this isolation is neither complete nor prohibitive for the movements of people and the exchange of goods and ideas. From times immemorial the roads that connect the peripheral parts of the Balkans with one another have been explored and the traffic on

³ ὕγρὰ κέλευθα.

them has never since come to a standstill. Isolation thus coexists in the continental block with linkage, connection, and fusion.

The ways of continental traffic through the mountains were of less importance than the "wet paths" over the sea, and the big rivers. And yet, since the Balkan area is in itself a link between Central Europe and Asia Minor, these difficult and often dangerous continental roads were always important as lines of communication and channels of exchange. Therefore the northern and southern parts of the Balkans, the Aegean zone, and the continental block, although different, remain through history linked with deep and lasting bonds with both the Eurasian mainland, and Asia Minor, Egypt, and Italy. According to this fundamental structure of its anthropogeography the whole history of the Balkans has as its essential feature an extreme complexity, a strong differentiation in the frame of a basic unity, combined with intimate contacts of the peripheral parts with neighbouring areas.

The subject of this survey are the ancient languages of the Balkans, all with the exception of Greek, which is well known and must be treated in separate volumes and by other methods. An outline of the available information about the rest of them will be presented here in order to complete the picture of the ancient linguistic state of the area.

As a point of departure, we may use the sketch drawn by Strabo in describing the part of Europe south of the Danube:⁴

The remainder of Europe consists of the country which is between the Ister and the encircling sea, beginning at the recess of the Adriatic and extending as far as the Sacred Mouth of the Ister. In this country are Greece and the tribes of the Macedonians and of the Epeirotes, and all those tribes above them whose countries reach to the Ister and to the

⁴ Λοιπή δ' ἐστὶ τῆς Εὐρώπης ἡ ἐντὸς Ἰστροῦ καὶ τῆς κύκλῳ θαλάττης, ἀρξαμένη ἀπὸ τοῦ μυχοῦ τοῦ Ἀδριατικοῦ μέχρι τοῦ ἱεροῦ στόματος τοῦ Ἰστροῦ, ἐν ᾗ ἔστιν ἡ τε Ἑλλὰς καὶ τὰ τῶν Μακεδόνων καὶ τῶν Ἡπειρωτῶν ἔθνη καὶ τὰ ὑπὲρ τούτων πρὸς τὸν Ἰστρον καθήκοντα καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἐφ' ἑκάτερα θάλατταν τὴν τε Ἀδριατικὴν καὶ τὴν Ποντικὴν, πρὸς μὲν τὴν Ἀδριατικὴν τὰ Ἰλλυρικά, πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἑτέραν μέχρι Προποντίδος καὶ Ἑλλησπόντου τὰ Θράκια καὶ εἴ τινα τούτοις ἀναμέμικται Σκυθικὰ ἢ Κελτικὰ. (Strabo 7.5.1)

seas on either side, both the Adriatic and the Pontic – to the Adriatic, the Illyrian tribes, and to the other sea as far as the Propontis and the Hellespont, the Thracian tribes and whatever Scythian or Celtic tribes are intermingled with them. (Strabo 7.5.1; translation from the edition in Loeb's Classical Library).

This description of the Balkanic peoples and of their territories is, of course, also highly relevant for the history of the languages since it can be assumed that every one of the ethnic groups mentioned by Strabo was, at least originally, distinguished also by a language of its own. This, of course, is only a working hypothesis and must be carefully checked in every single case. But it shows us which ethnic entities were distinguished by the ancient geographers in the Balkans and helps us to cover in our investigation the whole of its territory, thus offering a natural system of presentation.

This survey will, accordingly, follow the outline sketched by Strabo. Its chapters will be devoted successively to what is known about the Pre-Greek linguistic status of the Aegean area, about the language of the Epirotes and of the Macedonians, and lastly about that of the tribes designated by Strabo as *Illyrians* and *Thracians*.

2 PRE-GREEK

2.1 THE GREEK HISTORICAL RECORDS

As far as the preserved documents go, Greek was the language of the Aegean world, served as the medium of its superior culture, and in that capacity radiated into all adjacent areas. The decipherment of the Linear B tablets by Michael Ventris has shown that Greek was already the language of the Mycenaean kingdoms whose lore was preserved to posterity in the Homeric epics.⁵ It is thus established that already in the Late Bronze Age Greek was the most important language of Greece and was expanding its influence in Crete and the Archipelago.⁶ All other languages from which texts have been found in the same area, belong more or less isolated regions.

And yet, Greek is clearly not the oldest language of the Aegean area, neither in the Archipelago nor in Crete or the mainland. The historical tradition of classical Greece is quite explicit on that point. Herodotus writes that, before the Greeks, the Pelasgians were the inhabitants of Greece⁷ and that Hellas was called *Pelagias* before.⁸

⁵ Cf. VENTRIS – CHADWICK (1956) and CHADWICK (1958).

⁶ The arguments presented by HAMPL (1960) in favour of a different interpretation of the evidence, in the sense that the Mycenaean Greek sources belong to a small linguistic minority, cannot be accepted as convincing.

⁷ Herodot 8.44: Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ἐπὶ μὲν Πελασγῶν ἐχόντων τὴν νῦν Ἑλλάδα καλεομένην ἦσαν Πελασγοί, ὀνομαζόμενοι Κραναοί [...]

And these Pelasgians were barbarians speaking a non-Greek tongue.⁹

Perhaps the richest synthesis of traditions about the Pre-Greek inhabitants of Greece is found in the work of the geographer Strabo. For its importance it shall be quoted here in full:

Now Hecataeus of Miletus says of the Peloponnesus that before the time of the Greeks it was inhabited by barbarians. Yet one might say that in the ancient times the whole of Greece was a settlement of barbarians, if one reasons from the traditions themselves: Pelops brought over peoples from Phrygia to the Peloponnesus that received its name from him; and Danaüs from Egypt; whereas the Dryopes, the Caucones, the Pelasgi, the Leleges, and other such peoples, apportioned among themselves the parts that are inside the isthmus – and also the parts outside, for Attica was once held by the Thracians who came with Eumolpus, Daulis in Phocis by Tereus, Cadmeia by the Phoenicians who came with Cadmus, and Boeotia itself by the Aones and Temmices and Hyantes. According to Pindar, there was a time when the Boeotian tribe was called 'Syas'. Moreover, the barbarian origin of some is indicated by their names – Cecrops, Codrus, Aëclus, Cothus, Drymas, and Crinacus. And even to the present day the Thracians, Illyrians, and Epeirots live on the flanks of the Greeks (though this was still more the case formerly than now; indeed most of the country that at the present time is indisputably Greece was held by the barbarians – Macedonia and certain parts of Thessaly by the Thracians, and the parts above Acarnania and Aetolia by the Thesproti, the Cassiopaei, the Amphiloichi, the Molossi, and the Athamanes-Epeirotic tribes.¹⁰

⁸ Herodot 2.56: [...] τῆς νῦν Ἑλλάδος, πρότερον δὲ Πελασγίης καλεωμένης τῆς αὐτῆς ταύτης [...]

⁹ Herodot 1.57: [...] εἰ τοῦτοις τεκμαιρόμενον δεῖ λέγειν, ἦσαν οἱ Πελασγοὶ βάρβαρον γλῶσσαν ἰέντες.

¹⁰ Ἐκαταῖος μὲν οὖν ὁ Μιλήσιος περὶ τῆς Πελοποννήσου φησὶν διότι πρὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἦκον αὐτὴν βάρβαροι. σχεδὸν δὲ τι καὶ ἡ σύμπασα Ἑλλὰς κατοικία βαρβάρων ὑπῆρξε τὸ παλαιόν, ἀπ' αὐτῶν λογιζομένοις τῶν μνημονευομένων, Πέλοπος μὲν ἐκ τῆς Φρυγίας ἐπαγαγομένου εἰς τὴν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ κληθεῖσαν Πελοπόννησον, Δαναοῦ δὲ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, Δρυόπων τε καὶ Κανκῶνων καὶ Πελασγῶν καὶ Αελέων καὶ τοιούτων κατανεμαμένων τὰ ἐντὸς Ἰσθμοῦ καὶ τὰ ἐκτὸς δὲ τὴν μὲν γὰρ Ἀττικὴν οἱ μετὰ Εὐμόλπου Θοῤᾳκες ἔσχον, τῆς δὲ Φωκίδος τὴν Δαυλίδα Τηρεὺς, τὴν δὲ Καδμεῖαν οἱ μετὰ Κᾶδμου Φοῖνικες, αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν Βοιωτίαν Ἀονες καὶ Τέμμιες καὶ Ὑάντες, ὥς δὲ Πίνδαρος φησιν ἦν ὅτε σῶας Βοιώτιον ἔθνος ἔνεπον. καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀνομάτων δὲ ἐνίων τὰ βάρβαρον ἐμφαίνεται. Κέκροψ καὶ Κόδρος καὶ Αἰκλος καὶ Κόθος καὶ Δρύ-

Hecataeus is mentioned in the beginning of this passage, but it is not easy to know just how much of the information given here is derived from his works. Strabo shows clearly how aware the Greeks were of the fact that their language was a newcomer in Greece and that their contact with people speaking "barbarian" languages in earlier times was much closer than it was later.

In this passage, mythical and legendary tradition is closely intermingled with real historical data. The legends of Pelops and Danaos are mentioned together with some scanty information about such ethnic groups as the Cauconians, the Lelegians, and the Pelasgians. This shows how difficult it is to use critically the ancient sources for the Pre-Greek settlement of Hellas.

The traditional Greek approach to ethnological subjects of introducing eponymous heroes and including them in a most intricate and often contradictory genealogical system does not make things easier. The critical evaluation of information drawn from ancient writers therefore presents a host of most difficult questions which cannot be fully discussed in the limited context of this work. And yet, their importance for our notions of the extinct languages of the ancient Balkans is basic. So we cannot avoid sketching at least the essentials of the whole complex, giving at the same time the bibliographic references necessary for a more profound study of the subject.

In the passage from Strabo cited above, it is comparatively easy to separate the data about ethnic groups from the mythological and legendary traditions about "barbarian" presence in the Greece of ancient times. Pelops from Phrygia and Danaos from Egypt patently cannot seriously be taken into consideration, although the possibility that they represent some confused historical recollections can never be completely excluded. The same holds for Kadmos and

μας καὶ Κρίνακος. οἱ δὲ Θρᾷκες καὶ Ἰλλυριοὶ καὶ Ἡπειρώται καὶ μέχρι νῦν ἐν πλευραῖς εἰσιν. ἔτι μέντοι μᾶλλον πρότερον ἢ νῦν, ὅπου γε καὶ τῆς ἐν τῷ παρόντι Ἑλλάδος ἀναντιλέκτως οὐσης τὴν πολλὴν οἱ βάρβαροι ἔχουσι, Μακεδονίαν μὲν Θρᾷκες καὶ τινὰ μέρη τῆς Θετταλίας, Ἀκαρνανίας δὲ καὶ Αἰτωλίας τὰ ἄνω Θεσσωτοὶ καὶ Κασσωπαῖοι καὶ Ἀμφίλοχοι καὶ Ἀθαμᾶνες, Ἡπειρωτικὰ ἔθνη. (Strabo 7.7.1)

his Phoenician band in Thebes. The Thracian settlements in Attica and Daulis, although they are connected with the mythical names of Eumolpos and Tereus, are to be taken more seriously since they are not so obvious a part of aetiological constructions as are the traditions mentioned earlier. It is interesting, in general, how conscious the ancient Greeks remained of their original intimate connections with the Illyrian, Thracian, and Epirotic barbarians although in historical times the northern Balkans became for them a world effectively more foreign than Phrygia, Egypt, or Phoenicia.

Of non-Greek and Pre-Greek ethnic groups in Greece, Strabo mentions the Dryopes, the Cauconians, the Pelasgians, and the Lelegians, all in the Peloponnesus, and the Aonians, the Temmikes, and the Hyantes in Boeotia. No other ancient source contains such a rich enumeration of Pre-Greek peoples. We shall comment on this list with a few words.

Of all the Pre-Greek groups, the Pelasgians are most important in ancient literature. But what we read about them is mostly confused and contradictory. This fact induced the writers to try to overcome the existing difficulties by making bold combinations and introducing uncontrolled explanations. The result is a great amount of confusion and a variety of opinions that makes a conclusive pronouncement on the question almost impossible. Servius, the commentator of Vergil's poems, sums it up in commenting the name *Pelasgi* with the laconic words: "*de his varia est opinio*."¹¹ Modern scholars tried to disentangle the real information about the Pelasgians from the many literary constructions that have overgrown it in the course of many centuries.

Fundamental in this respect is the study of E. Meyer on the ancient literary tradition about the Pelasgians.¹² His attitude is very critical; as a consequence the results of his search for historical information are scant. The many controversial informations about the Pelasgians must, according to this opinion, be almost entirely discarded as products of literary constructions. Thus the Pelasgians

¹¹ Aen. 8.600

¹² E. MEYER (1892)

belong more to literature than to history. The whole question is thus reduced to an inquiry into the nature of the sources the logographers and the writers of the fifth century had at their disposal while writing about the Pelasgians.

According to Meyer (1892), the historical tradition that the Pelasgians were the Pre-Hellenic, barbarian population of almost the whole of Greece is the product of a purely literary development. The only historical Pelasgians were those in Thessaly whose country is called in the epics Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος and in more recent times Πελασγιῶτις with Λάρισα as its town. These Pelasgians were, according to Meyer, the oldest masters of the Thessalian plain, and the memory of their mighty kings at Larisa remained vivid long after they had disappeared from the historical scene.¹³ They were, in Meyer's opinion, a Greek tribe and had descended to the lowlands from the harsh mountains of Epirus, where their name remained connected with the shrine of Dodona.¹⁴

But the first masters of the plain, the Pelasgians in Larisa and the Thessalian Argos, succumbed to the onslaught of other Greek mountaineers coming from the same rough hills from which the Pelasgians had once begun the conquest of the plains. These new conquerors were another Greek tribe, the Hellenes, the later inhabitants of Thessaly and the Pelasgian Argos, well known to Homer, the countrymen of Achilles.¹⁵ The Thessalian plain was

¹³ Homer Il. 2.261; Strabo 5.2.4; Hecataeus in Schol.Apoll.Rhod. 4.226; Hellanicus in Suidas s.v. τετραρχία and in Schol.Apoll.Rhod. 1.40; Anth.Pal. 14.73.

¹⁴ Cf. Homer Il. 16.233:

Ζεῦ ἄνα Δωδωναίε Πελασγικέ, τηλόθι ναίων,
Δωδώνης μεδέων δυσχειμέρον, ἀμφὶ δὲ Σελλοὶ
σοὶ ναίονσ' ὑποφῆται ἀνιπτόποδες χαμαιεῦναι.

Hesiodus frgm. 212 in Strabo 7.7.10: Δωδώνην φηγόν τε, Πελασγῶν ἔδραν ᾗεν; Callimachus Del. 284-286: ἃ Δωδώνηθε Πελασγοὶ τηλόθεν ἐκβαίνοντα πολὺ πρόωιστα δέχονται γηλεές θεράποντες ἀσιγῆτοιο λέβ

¹⁵ The Hellenes, too, left, as it seems, some traces in Dodona. Their name "Ἕλληνες" is probably to be connected with the name of the priests of the Dodonian shrine, which name in Homer Il. 16.234 reads Ἐλλοὶ or Σελλοὶ. Cf. also Pindar in Strabo 7.7.10 for the first and Sophocles Trach. 1166- for the second form. Hesiodus in Strabo 7.7.10 calls the country in which Dodona lies Ἕλλοπίνη. - Cf. BUDIMIR (1952).

called *Hellas* after them and in epic poetry was styled "famous for its beautiful women". And these names *Hellenes* and *Hellas* were destined to become in the course of time the common denomination of all the Greeks and the whole of their country.

The Pelasgians, however, in the literary tradition remained the oldest dwellers of the northern plain, sons of the Black Earth. As foes of the Hellenes they could not be introduced in the lay of the Trojan war as the allies of Achilles, the ruler of *Hellas* and the Pelasgian Argos, but were presented there among the peoples fighting on the side of the Trojans.¹⁶ Here begins, already in the *Iliad*, the literary development of the tradition about the Pelasgians, which in the course of time lost almost all relation to historical reality.

In the *Odyssey* the Pelasgians are mentioned as one of the many peoples on Crete.¹⁷ Meyer believes that they were a group that had left Thessaly in the times of the Hellenic conquest of that country.

All other traditions about the Pelasgians are, according to Meyer (1892), the result of literary constructions and later elaborations. They came to be regarded as barbarians because the eponymous hero of the Hellenes, Hellen, son of Deucalion, in the genealogies was younger than king Pelasgos, son of the Earth, the eponymous hero of the Pelasgians.¹⁸ The Pelasgians therefore belong to a time when there not be regarded as Hellenes.

¹⁶ Cf. Homer Il. 2.681- and 840-; 10.429-; 17.288-.

¹⁷ Homer Od. 19.172-:

Κρήτη τις γαῖ' ἔστι, μέσῳ ἐνὶ οἴνοπι πόντῳ
καλὴ καὶ πείρα, περίρρυτος· ἐν δ' ἀνθρωποὶ
πολλοί, ἀπειρέσιοι, καὶ ἐννήκοντα πόλεις.
ἄλλη δ' ἄλλων γλῶσσα μεμιγμένη· ἐν μὲν Ἀχαιοί,
ἐν δ' Ἑτεόκρητες μεγαλήτορες, ἐν δὲ Κύδωνες
Δωριεὺς τε τριχάϊκες δίοι τε Πελασγοί·

¹⁸ Cf. Pausanias 8.1.4 with a fragment of Asios:

Ἀντίθεον δὲ Πελασγὸν ἐν ὑπνικόμοισιν ὄρεσσιν
γαῖα μέλαινα ἀνέδωκεν, ἵνα θνητῶν γένος εἴη.

Apollodorus 2.1.1=3.8.1; Servius in Aen. 2.83: *Pelasgi a Pelasgo terrae filio, qui in Arcadia genitus dicitur, ut Hesiodus tradit.*

Thus the Pelasgians came to be regarded as autochthonous barbarians, as Herodotus describes them; later, the Tyrrhenian groups of Lemnos and Creston, speaking in historical times a non-Greek language, came to be regarded as their remnants. In literature the Pelasgians were connected in the course of time with almost every part of the Greek World. Thus Pelasgians are known in Attica, in the Peloponnesus, and in many other places including Asia Minor and Italy.¹⁹

Meyer's critical appreciation of the ancient sources about the Pelasgians has remained authoritative in all essentials to the present day. Yet, more recent scholars rather tend to accept the non-Greek character of the Pelasgian people as stated by the sources.²⁰ This is, indeed, an acceptable interpretation of the evidence of the writers, since the Greeks in their confused tradition were well aware of a non-Greek autochthonous population called *Pelasgians* and it is difficult to assume, as Meyer does, that this tradition came about only by confusion of the Pelasgians with the Tyrrhenians. And yet, it is essential to remember that the whole tradition about the Pelasgians is to a very considerable extent a literary phenomenon and has to be investigated as such.

The ethnic name of the Pelasgians is currently used as a label for a reconstructed language which is supposed to be Pre-Greek. This of course is only a modern linguistic convention and has no direct connection with any ethnic reality on which the writing of ancient authors about the Pelasgians may have been based. The modern use of the term can neither confirm nor falsify their information.

Another ethnic group in ancient literary tradition connected with non-Greek autochthony are the Lelegians. The evidence of writers about them is even more scarce and confused and it is almost impossible to extract any trustworthy information from it. Even for

¹⁹ Cf. E. MEYER (1892) and LOCHNER-HÜTTENBACH (1960). The first explicit identification of Pelasgians and Tyrrhaenians was made by Hellanicus. Cf. Dionysius Halicarnassius 1.28.3.

²⁰ So SCHACHERMEYER (1929: 256-), LOCHNER-HÜTTENBACH (1960: 139-); cf. also MYRES (1907: 170-225), JOSIFOVIĆ (1957: 209).

the ancients they were just a name, connected with autochthonous antiquity. They are also closely associated to the Carians, known to us in historical times as a people in south-western Asia Minor speaking a language which, as it seems, belonged to the Anatolian group of Indo-European languages.²¹ But in explaining the exact nature of this association the sources are contradictory and do not give us the information we need.

Herodotus writes that the Carians in Asia Minor had come from the Aegean islands, where they were originally subjects of king Minos and were called *Lelegians*.²² Philippos of Suangela says that until his time the Carians held the Lelegians as slaves.²³ This suggests a relation like that between the Spartans and the Helots in Laconia, and that of the Thessalians to the Penestai in Thessaly. Strabo refers to both opinions and writes that in the country around Miletos some settlements are said to be Lelegian and that on many places in Caria graves and deserted fortifications were called after them. They and the Carians were the original inhabitants of the whole of Ionia. According to Strabo another group of Lelegians lived in Troas, at the foot of the Ida mountain, near the town of Pedasos and the river Satnioeis. From Ionia they were expelled by the Ionian settlers, from Troas by the conquerors of Troy.²⁴ The refugees from Pedasos settled, according to Callisthenes, in the

²¹ Cf. ŠEVOROŠKIN (1962, 1964, 1965).

²² Herodot 1.171: εἰσὶ δὲ τούτων Κᾶρες μὲν ἀπικμένοι ἐς τὴν ἡπειρον ἐκ τῶν νήσων· τὸ γὰρ παλαιὸν ὄντες Μῖνω κατήκοοι καὶ καλεόμενοι Λέλεγες εἶχον τὰς νήσους. [...]

²³ In a fragment quoted by Athenaeus 6.271b: Φίλιππος ὁ Θεαγγελεὺς ἐν τῷ περὶ Καρῶν καὶ Λελέγων συγγράμματι καταλέξας τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίων εἰλωτας καὶ τοὺς Θετταλικούς πενέστας καὶ Κᾶρας φησὶ τοῖς Λέλεξιν ὡς οἰκέταις χρῆσασθαι πάλαι τε καὶ νῦν.

²⁴ Strabo 7.7.2: τοὺς δὲ Λέλεγας τινὲς μὲν τοὺς αὐτοὺς Καρσὶν εἰκάζουσιν, οἱ δὲ συνοίκους μόνον καὶ συστρατιώτας· διόπερ ἐν τῇ Μιλήσιᾳ Λελέγων κατοικίας λέγεσθαι τινας, πολλοῦ δὲ τῆς Καρίας τάφους Λελέγων καὶ ἐρύματα ἔρημα Λελέγεια καλούμενα· ἢ τε Ἰωνία νῦν λεγομένη πᾶσα ὑπὸ Καρῶν ὥκειτο καὶ Λελέγων· ἐκβαλόντες δὲ τοὺς οἱ Ἰωνεὺς αὐτοὶ τὴν χώραν κατέσχον, ἔτι δὲ πρότερον οἱ τὴν Τροίαν ἐλόντες ἐξήλασαν τοὺς Λέλεγας ἐκ τῶν περὶ τὴν Ἰδὴν τόπων τῶν κατὰ Πήδασον καὶ τῶν Σατνιόεντα ποταμῶν. - Cf. also 13.1.59: ἐν ὅλῃ δὲ Καρία καὶ ἐν Μιλήτῳ Λελέγων τάφοι καὶ ἐρύματα καὶ ἔρημα κατοικίων δέκνυνται.

country around Halicarnassus. Eight cities there are said to be Lelegian.²⁵ Pherecydes, on the contrary, states that in earlier times Carians held the whole country around Miletos, Myus, Ephesos, and Cape Mycale, while Lelegians settled to the north, on the coast as far as Phocaea, and on the islands of Chios and Samos.²⁶ According to this author, the Lelegians were distinct from and independent of the Carians. Such a view can be confirmed by the fact that Homer, speaking about the auxiliary troupes of the Trojans, mentions the two peoples independently and on an equal footing.²⁷ The lyric poet Alcaeus calls Antandrus in Mysia, below the Ida mountain, a city of the Lelegians (Strabo 13.1.51). The evidence about Lelegians in Asia Minor given by later authors is of less importance.²⁸

By mentioning Lelegians among the autochthonous barbarians on the Greek mainland, Strabo follows quite an ancient tradition. Already Hesiodus had sung about the Lelegian population of Locria.²⁹ Aristotle mentions them in his lost *Politeiai* as ancient inhabitants of north-western Greece and conquerors of Boeotia. He also writes about an autochthon Lelex in that region whose grandsons afterwards settled on the island of Leucas.³⁰ Lelegians on the Peloponnesus, as mentioned by Strabo, are known to other authors, too. An autochthonous king Lelex is believed to have lived and ruled in Laconia and Messenia.³¹ An homonymous king appears in the genealogies of Megara.³²

²⁵ Cf. Strabo 13.1.58–59.

²⁶ Cf. Strabo 14.1.3: *Ταύτης δὲ φησι Φερεκύδης Μίλητον μὲν καὶ Μυοῦντα καὶ τὰ περὶ Μυκάλην καὶ Ἐφεσον Κάρως ἔχειν πρότερον, τὴν δ' ἐξῆς παραλίαν μέχρι Φωκαίας καὶ Χίου καὶ Σάμον, ἧς Ἀγκαῖος ἦρχε, Λέλεγας.*

²⁷ Cf. Homer II. 10.428–429:

*πρὸς μὲν ἄλδς Κάρως καὶ Παίονες ἀγκυλότοχοι
καὶ Λέλεγες καὶ Κανῶνες δίοι τε Πελασγοί, [...]*

²⁸ Cf. Stephanus Byzantinus s.v. *Μίλητος*; Plutarchus, *Quaestiones Graecae* 46; and others.

²⁹ Cf. Strabo 7.7.2.

³⁰ Cf. Strabo 7.7.2.

³¹ Cf. Pausanias 3.1; 4.1; and Apollodorus 3.10.3.

³² Cf. Pausanias 1.39.6; 4.36.1.

The evidence shows clearly how uncertain the knowledge of the ancients was. It does not allow us to form any opinion on the real historical role and geographical area of this Pre-Greek people in the Aegean world. Thus all efforts of modern scholars lead either to uncritical and wild combinations, or remain quite tentative and unsatisfactory.³³

The Carians, in ancient literary tradition closely connected with the Lelegians, were also known as part of the Pre-Greek population, especially on the Aegean islands, but also on the Helladic mainland. The chief authority on this subject is Thucydides who writes that Carians lived on the Cyclades from where they were expelled by king Minos when he imposed his thalassocracy on the Greek Sea. These Carians were dangerous pirates. When during the Peloponnesian War a ritual purification of the sacred island of Delos was performed, the graves there were opened and the dead removed, more than half of them could be recognized as Carians by their weapons and by the way in which they were buried.³⁴

Aristotle writes that Carians had conquered Epidaurus and Hermione on the Peloponnesus in very ancient times, before the Heraclides came down to their heritage.³⁵ According to Herodotus (1.171), the tradition about Carians on the Aegean islands is of Cretan origin and the Carians in Asia Minor do not accept it.

Another ethnic group mentioned by Strabo in the Pre-Greek Peloponnesus were the Dryopes. They were a tribe known to have lived at the foot of the Oeta mountain at the Maliac gulf to the south of the town of Lamia. Aristotle wrote that they were driven out of their land by Heracles and settled in the region of Asine in the north-eastern Peloponnesus.³⁶ According to Herodotus (8.43, 73), after their defeat the Dryopes settled in Hermione in the same

³³ Cf. DEIMLING (1862; very uncritical), ALY (1909), MEYER (1893: 59–, 246–), KRETSCHMER (1896: 376), SCHACHERMEYER 1929: 276), LOCHNER-HÜTTENBACH (1960: 133, 139).

³⁴ Cf. Thucydides 1.4 and 1.8.1.

³⁵ Cf. Strabo 8.6.15.

³⁶ Cf. Strabo 8.6.13; 9.5.10. Also Pausanias 4.34.9–12 and Herodotus 1.56, 146; 8.73.

region of the Peloponnesus. Elsewhere (8.46), he describes the Styrians and the Cythnians as Dryopes.

The name *Dryopes* is transparently Greek and means 'Oak-people'. One is therefore inclined to see in them the rest of an older stratum of Greek settlement or an Indo-European tribe closely related to the Greeks. This could explain how they came to be regarded as barbarians. In any case they did not belong to one of the big groups of which the Greek people was composed.

Among the Pre-Greek Peloponnesians Strabo also mentions the Caucones. They were known already to Homer.³⁷ The goddess Athena refers to them while speaking to Nestor in Pylos, and it can be understood that they are a people in the neighborhood. This is confirmed by Strabo who writes that they were the masters of Lepreum, Cyparissia, and Macistum on the western coast of the Peloponnesus. They were of Arcadian origin and settled in what later became Elis.³⁸ Another ethnic group with the same name is recorded in Asia Minor in Paphlagonia.³⁹

The Aones, Temmices, and Hyantes are known to be Pre-Greek ethnic groups which settled in Boeotia together with the Lelegians.⁴⁰

Other non-Greek and presumably Pre-Greek ethnic groups were the Eteocretans and the Tyrsenians. The name Ἐτεόκρητες means 'true Cretans' and designates the oldest stratum of the ancient Cretan population.⁴¹ The Athenian tribute lists refer in a similar way to the autochthonous population of the island of Carpathos as to Eteocarthians.

The Tyrsenians are of special interest among these most ancient Aegean peoples since they are homonymous with the Etruscans in Italy. In historical times they were known to live on the northern islands of Imbros and Lemnos. They are also mentioned in the

³⁷ Homer II. 10.429; Od. 3.366.

³⁸ Cf. Strabo 8.3.3, 16–17, 29, 30.

³⁹ Cf. Strabo 8.3.17; 12.3.2, 5; 14.5.23, 28.

⁴⁰ Cf. Strabo 9.2.3: Ἡ δ' οὖν Βοιωτία πρότερον μὲν ὑπὸ βαρβάρων ᾤκειτο Ἀδωνίων καὶ Τεμνίκων ἐν τοῦ Σουνίου πεπλανημένων καὶ Λελέγων καὶ Ὑάντων. – Cf. also Pausanias 9.5.1; 10.35.5; Stephanus Byzantinus s.v. Ὑάντες, Αἰτωλία.

⁴¹ Homer Od. 19.177.

neighborhood of Creston, a little-known city in Thrace, further in Mysian Antandros, and on the island of Samothrace. Less definite is the evidence for their presence in north-western Asia Minor.⁴² These Tyrsenians were dreaded as pirates.⁴³ In ancient literature they are closely connected with the Pelasgians; Hellanicus from Lesbos was the first to identify the two peoples completely.⁴⁴

This short survey of Greek historical records shows how the memory of a Pre-Greek settlement of Hellas was preserved till classical times. But it has also become apparent how uncertain and unsubstantial these recollections were. Modern scholarship is at a complete loss when faced with these records, trying to use them as positive evidence for the older ethnic strata in the Aegean area. No critical method is sharp enough to clarify the questions and resolve the dilemmas that arise at any attempt to give a full interpretation of the ancient literary records. And yet, as tantalizing as it may be, this kind of research will always remain important and necessary.

2.2 THE HISTORICAL SETTING

To understand properly the whole complex of Pre-Greek linguistics, it is useful to acquaint oneself with the historical frame in which it is placed. Aegean archaeology was successful enough to offer a firm basis for such an endeavour. The recent decipherment of Linear B has shed further light on the history of the Aegean Bronze Age. The purely linguistic problem of Pre-Greek can thus be successfully viewed in a broader historical context and ceases to be restricted to technical reconstruction of language data only.

Especially important is the chronological orientation provided by such an inclusion of historical data into linguistic consideration.

⁴² Cf. Herodotus 1.57; Thucydides 4.109; Diodorus 10.19; Apollonius Rhodius 4.1760; Plutarchus, De virtute muliebri 8; Plutarchus, Quaestiones Graecae 12; Polyaeus 7.49; Diogenes Laertius 8.1; Porphyrius, Vita Pythagorae 2. – About this literary tradition cf. MEYER (1892: 19–).

⁴³ Cf. Homer, Hymn to Dionysus 6.8; Apollodorus 3.5.3.2; Athenaeus 15.672.

⁴⁴ Dionysius Halicarnassius 1.28.3.

All too many questions remain, of course, controversial in this context, some even remain quite obscure. In this brief introduction, it is not possible to offer anything like a full discussion of such problems. We shall therefore refrain from a more detailed presentation and try to give only the best-established facts. To our judgement, the best synthesis in this field has been given by Schachermeyr.⁴⁵ In this sketch we shall follow him in all essentials.

If we look at the types of pre-historic material culture, the Aegean world can roughly be divided into four main areas: Macedonia, the Greek peninsula (Hellas), the Cycladic islands, and Crete. During the many centuries of prehistoric life, these areas gained their unmistakable individuality. At some times they were integrated into broader cultural patterns, at others they were separated by well-defined cultural boundaries. Although they were always part of one sphere of spiritual outlook and material skill, it is useful to distinguish them from each other and in this survey to look at them as separate entities.

The chronology of the Aegean prehistory is based, as elsewhere, on the succession of three stages of technological skill, an older and a more recent part of the Stone Age: the Palaeolithic and the Neolithic, and the Bronze Age. Each of these in turn comprises stages of internal development which manifest themselves in certain types of material culture and technology. Especially the Bronze Age shows a clearly expressed subdivision. One generally distinguishes an early, a middle, and a late stage, each of which can in turn be further subdivided into three periods usually marked with roman ciphers (I, II, III). The stages of the Aegean Bronze Age are generally distinguished as to their areal type and called accordingly Helladic, Cycladic and Minoan for the Greek mainland, the Archipelago and Crete respectively.

This sequence provided by archaeological typology gives a chronological frame for the most ancient periods of Aegean culture. But this chronology remains, of course, only relative and therefore of restricted value. To obtain an absolute dating of the established

⁴⁵ Cf. SCHACHERMEYR (1954), TITOV (1969), ZAFIROPULO (1964).

stages one has to make use of additional information. The data required can be secured through comparison with the archaeological typology of Egypt and Mesopotamia, where historical records allow a more or less dependable fixing of dates even for such a remote past.

Such comparison makes it possible to correlate features of Aegean culture with names and dates from the dynastic lists of Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria. Archaeological findings point to cultural contacts mainly between Crete and Egypt and between Asia Minor and Mesopotamia. The chronological data obtained can be used also for the Greek mainland because of the many links by which it was connected with Crete and to a certain extent also with Asia Minor. In such a way, the relative chronology derived from archaeological typology and stratigraphy can be converted into a more or less dependable absolute chronology which permits us to establish approximately the most crucial dates in the earliest developments of the Aegean world.

All these chronological endeavours can of course lead only to a very limited success. Many important questions must remain open, and the answers to others remain uncertain and hypothetical. But if we accept the fact that every dating on this basis must be rough and always qualified by a strongly emphasized plus or minus, a general chronological frame can be erected on these shaky foundations and in its entirety it shows a remarkable solidity. Scholars were thus able to arrive at a general consensus about the chronology of the early Aegean culture. Datings proposed independently and simultaneously by different scholars corresponded basically, especially those by scholars who accepted the more conservative dating of Egyptian and Mesopotamian dynasties as advocated recently in Egyptology and Assyriology. For all its uncertainties, such a chronological frame is very useful for the study of the early Aegean. For its linguistic history, it is of the utmost value.

The divergencies among the proposed datings being small and of little importance, we are able to give a chronological framework that synthesizes the results arrived at by recent scholarship. We do so in presenting the dates proposed by Schachermeyr. They

differ only little from those proposed by Milošević, Matz, and Childe⁴⁶ and correspond with the chronological scheme given by Wace⁴⁷ and Hutchinson:⁴⁸

Beginning of the Neolithic Age: 4th millennium
Beginning of the Dimini culture: ca. 2800 B.C.

Early Minoan:	2700–2000
Middle Minoan:	2000–1580
Late Minoan:	1580–1000?
Early Helladic and Cycladic:	2600–1950
Middle Helladic and Cycladic:	1950–1580
Late Helladic and Cycladic:	1580–1200

The Late Helladic Age is often called *Mycenean*, after the most important site that represents this type of culture. From 1200 onwards the Late Helladic culture continued to exist in a very degenerated and deteriorated form. The culture of that period of late decay is often called *Submycenaean*.

The Palaeolithic Age in the Aegean area is quite insufficiently explored. Some rough stone tools found in Boeotia and on the island of Zacynthus show that Greece was inhabited in these times. Further research may lead to very important information about Palaeolithic Greece. On Crete only very uncertain traces of Palaeolithic man have been found.

Finds of the Neolithic Age are, on the other hand, very rich and indicate an important cultural development. The main sites are in Thessaly on whose fertile plains agriculture was early developed. It did not originate there, but was imported from Mesopotamia, Syria and Eastern Anatolia, the cradle of agriculture in this part of the world. There is such a wealth of significant correspondences in form and technology that they cannot be assumed to be spontaneous and fortuitous, but prove an essential dependence.

⁴⁶ SCHACHERMEYER (1954: 1358–).

⁴⁷ VENTRIS-CHADWICK (1956: xvii).

⁴⁸ Cf. HUTCHINSON (1962: 17–9).

The older Neolithic culture of Thessaly is called *Sesklo* after its most important and best-excavated site. It was quite predominantly agricultural in character, but not rural. The ruins of the settlements show clearly that small towns already existed. The urbanization of the Aegean world thus begins early in the Neolithic and one can hence better appreciate its deep roots. Architecture and ceramic craftsmanship show the development that could be expected in such a cultural setting. In the houses, statuettes have been found that must be interpreted as idols. They are mostly female with strongly stressed sex properties. Male statuettes are phallic. We can infer that the religion of this agricultural population was centered on a fertility cult whose main figure was a Mother Goddess. This again suggests matriarchal traits in social organization and outlook.

To the north, the Neolithic culture of Thessaly radiated as far as the plains of the Danube. As could be expected, Macedonia belonged to its broader area also. An early Neolithic culture of the *Sesklo* type can be shown to have existed almost over the whole of mainland Greece: in the valley of the Spercheus, in Boeotia, in Athens and Attica, on the Peloponnese, especially in the north-east, in Aetolia, and on the Ionian islands. Some *Sesklo* sites have been found even on the Archipelago. From this and other indications one can conclude that already in Neolithic Greece some sea-faring must have been practiced.

The Neolithic culture of Crete was in many respects closely related to that of Thessaly with which it shows deep correspondences. And yet, it has so many traits different and of its own that it must be separated and regarded as a distinct cultural province. The current of eastern influence which generated the cultural type of *Sesklo* merged here with another coming from Africa.⁴⁹

In the Early and Middle Neolithic, the whole of the Aegean area manifested a deep-rooted cultural unity with more or less strongly expressed local variants. The cultural individuality of Crete was the strongest in the whole complex.

In the Late Neolithic Age, this unity was disrupted, as it seems,

⁴⁹ Cf. also HUTCHINSON (1962: 45–).

in a violent way. The clearest and fullest information is furnished again by Thessalian sites. A culture of a different and new type appears there. Near Sesklo, at Dimini, a fortified settlement was erected with a chieftain's residence on the top. The system of round fortification walls and the square building of the leader's abode with columns supporting its roof, a real rudimentary megaron, in a fascinating way foreshadow the mighty splendor of Mycenaean palaces. The early Neolithic town of Sesklo was destroyed and a settlement of the new cultural type was erected on its site. This later Neolithic culture in Greece is called *Dimini* after its most representative site.

There are many indications that this new Neolithic type of culture was brought to Thessaly by immigrants from the north which left their former habitat somewhere in the Hungarian plains. Yet this view has not remained undisputed. Some archaeologists think that the new type developed organically from the Sesklo culture under a strong influence from the Cyclades and the Orient. Yet, the abrupt change, the warlike ethos suggested by the style of Dimini, and its numerous links with central Europe give much weight to the first explanation.

The culture of Dimini never covered the whole of Thessaly. A later phase of the Sesklo culture (Sub-Sesklo) coexisted with it. Sites of the Dimini type have also been found in the north-eastern Peloponnesus. But there too they seem to have been rather isolated among settlements of the older Neolithic type. This may have been the southernmost strongholds of the conquerors who came from the north. The style of their culture is in every respect rather forceful and lordlike. The main traits of a Neolithic agricultural society, however, were still preserved.

A last phase of Neolithic development is represented by the site of Rachmani, also in Thessaly. Compared with Dimini it shows a clear deterioration. Some of its traits can be interpreted as fresh influence from the north.

The Early Bronze Age began in the Aegeis with a strong and lasting influence from Anatolia. Changes were radical; all craftsmanship became centred around and influenced by the working of

copper and bronze. It remains uncertain whether this change was brought about by a migration or not. Anatolian influence remained strong during the whole Early Bronze Age; but very soon, the Aegeis began to influence Anatolia too.

It is in this period that the full development of the Cyclades and the Peloponnesus really begins. The population was dense and everything indicates an ever-growing economic prosperity. At this time begins also fishing and sea-faring on a big scale. On the Aegean islands strong economic and cultural centres were formed (Melus, Syrus, Euboea). On the mainland the Early Helladic Age began after a marked break in continuity. This break was on some sites almost complete, on others there is a short time span with strongly marked Cycladic correspondences. It is impossible, for the time being, to give a satisfactory historical interpretation to these facts.

The strongest characteristic of the Early Bronze Age in Greece is a general and all-pervasive urbanization of life. Agriculture lost its predominant importance. The population gathered in big cities and lived by handicraft and trade. The whole Aegean area was engaged in commerce and a lively exchange of goods can be shown to have taken place. The entire Aegean zone, including Macedonia and Crete, became thus one cultural province with well-developed relations to the outside world, especially with the East and with Africa. Cycladian traders reached the Adriatic and perhaps even the western Mediterranean. Politically, the area seems to have been a conglomerate of small states under local rulers. The cult of the Mother Goddess seems to have kept its central place, her statues being now frequently imported from the Cyclades, where a new style in sculpture had been developed.

The Middle Bronze Age begins on the Greek mainland and in Western Anatolia with a heavy catastrophe and an abrupt change in the patterns of material culture. In this respect, the contrast with Crete and the Cyclads is marked because there the tradition is more continuous and the passage from one age to the other rather gradual, and no traces of a general destruction and large-scale devastation could be detected. The Middle Bronze Age is on the islands a continuation of the Early Bronze Age, while on the main-

land it presents an essentially new cultural type. Thus the Aegean world ceases in this period to be an homogeneous culture area and is divided into a continental northern and an insular southern part.

In mainland Greece the Middle Helladic Age sets in with a catastrophe quite comparable to that which about 1200 B.C. marked the end of the rich flowering of Mycenaean Culture and was brought about by what we use to call the Dorian invasion. Asine, Tiryns, Zigurries, Koraku, Asea, Malthi, Eutresis, and Orchomenus, almost all important sites on the Peloponnesus and in Central Greece were burned. Many other settlements of the Early Bronze Age never recovered from devastation and ceased to exist. On other sites small villages took the place of important towns. In some cases settlements were rebuilt on somewhat different sites, in others new settlements were founded that did not exist before. Everywhere the archaeological evidence of the break is quite obvious. It shows that an intervention by an enemy took place on almost all sites and brought about a deep change in the patterns of social and cultural life. The density of population decreased considerably. The conquerors brought with them battle axes and horses which appeared then for the first time in the Aegean area. Their mode of burial also differs markedly from Aegean tradition.

As far as the general standard of cultural development goes, the Middle Helladic Age is unmistakably a period of regress and deterioration. This becomes obvious when its artefacts and buildings are compared with those of the Cyclades and Crete. The cause of this discrepancy was the initial catastrophe which brought with it not only a retardation of cultural growth, but gave also to this growth a somewhat new direction.

The mainland of Greece remained for some time in relative isolation from the maritime world. The general pattern of Helladic culture ceased to be urban, as it had been in the Early Bronze Age, and became essentially rural. The importance of weapons increased markedly and fortified hills were preferred as residences. Life in Greece seems to have become warlike. The megaron, a square building with a column-supported roof, continued to dominate representative architecture. There are no traces of sculpture, which

indicates that anthropomorphic religion had lost its importance. Features of material culture brought to the country by the northern invaders merged very soon with those characteristic of the indigenous population.

The passage to the Late Bronze Age, better known perhaps as the period of Mycenaean culture, was organic and gradual. Archaeological findings exclude any kind of catastrophe, break or large-scale immigration of conquering intruders. Specific Mycenaean features do not appear at all sites at once. Some of them continue to follow Middle Helladic patterns and show only slight Mycenaean influence (so Eutresis, Hagia Marina, Krisa, Asine, Eleusis, and Thorikos). Only in the last phase of the Late Bronze Age, these sites became really Mycenaean. This type of culture was individually developed in some outstanding residences such as Mycenae, Tiryns, and Pylos and spread from there over the whole of Greece. It was the outcome of an intensive Cretan influence on the life of Helladic palaces and princely families. Mycenaean culture was thus always elitarian in its essence and as such it cannot be connected with any ethnic group as a whole. It is the palace culture of warlike small rulers, an echo of Cretan outlook and luxury in fortified abodes of barbarian and heroic kings surrounded by bands of savage warriors.

The Mycenaean Age came to an end in fire and devastation. The catastrophe was general, and only destruction and misery was left behind. On the ruins, life went on in poverty and decay. The Submycenaean period is marked by a general lack of creativity. There was a general deterioration of the old pattern. It is only from about 1000 B.C. that a new cultural growth can be felt, that new patterns make their appearance. And they are those of Classical Greece.

At the end of this survey there is a crucial point that has yet to be discussed. It is the question where in this process of cultural development, as established by archaeology, the coming of the Greeks can be located. It is, of course, more correct to speak about the coming of 'tribes speaking Indo-European dialects that were to become Greek'. The Greek language as well as the Greek people were formed and shaped only in the Aegean world and are inconceivable without this background. The Indo-European dialects

which served as a basis for the development of the Greek language can for the sake of simplicity also be labeled Greek if it is kept in mind that they are such only in the sense of the genetic classification of Indo-European languages. In further simplification the speakers of that type of Indo-European which is genetically classified as Greek can be called *Greeks* irrespective of the total of features, historical, cultural and psychological, that establish the Greek people as an ethnic entity. It is only in this restricted sense that one can speak about the coming of the Greeks to Hellas.

Archaeological evidence – and this is the only kind of evidence at our disposal – can in some cases be interpreted as testifying to an immigration of a foreign population that spread over the Aegean area usually in the role of conquerors. The first in this series of immigrations seems to have taken place at the beginning of the Neolithic. These settlers came in great numbers to Thessaly and brought with them the art of the cultivation of the soil and of pottery making. They came from the East, from Anatolia, in all probability by the land route.

The culture of Dimini in the Later Stone Age can also be interpreted as a trace of an onslaught from the north.⁵⁰ These conquerors came from the Danubian plains. It does not seem likely that these people ever became masters of the whole of Greece, and their settlements remained enclaves. A second wave of such northern immigrants seems to be connected with the cultural type of Rachmani.

At the beginning and during the Early Bronze Age migration from Anatolia and the Northern Balkans can be assumed. However, archaeological evidence is much less clear in these instances and thus these shifts of population remain very hypothetical and obscure. In any case, no conquest with large-scale devastation took place. In Crete, there may have been some immigration from Libya.

The catastrophic break with clear traces of a general devastation at the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age shows conspicuous marks of an invasion. The abrupt cultural change that ensued indi-

⁵⁰ So SCHACHERMEYR after a thorough reexamination of the evidence; cf. SCHACHERMEYR (1954: 1476).

cates that there was probably a substantial change and renewal of population. The next archaeologically recorded migration into the Aegean area was that at the end of the Mycenaean period. This last wave of prehistoric migration can be identified with the Dorian invasion, recorded in Greek legendary history as the returning of the Heraclids to the country of their forefather. This was the last immigration of Greek-speaking tribes from the North. Such an interpretation of the archaeological evidence is confirmed by the fact that after the decipherment of Linear B by M. Ventris, Greek is proven to have been the language of the Mycenaean palaces. The immigration of the first speakers of Greek must thus be prior to that at the end of the Mycenaean Age.

For the location of the main migration of Greek speakers into Greece two established facts are of decisive importance: (a) Greek is demonstrably not the oldest language spoken in Greece and the Aegean area, and (b) Greek spread so universally over the entire Aegean area and imposed itself so successfully on the speakers of the substratum languages that a massive immigration of a substantial number of its speakers must be assumed. No small group of dynamic conquerors could have achieved that effect. It must have been a language community which really took the land, settled on it, and did not only rule it from some isolated strongholds.

The catastrophe and population change that mark the end of the Early and the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age show all the traits that could be expected in such a deep and far-reaching change in the structure of the population of mainland Greece. The spread of Greek speakers to Crete and the Archipelago was later and left its traces in the cultural strata of the palace at Cnossos. No other of the more or less firmly established migrations had such important consequences in the structure of population nor did it bring with it such a deep change of cultural patterns. They were also much more restricted in the areas of the Aegean World that came under their influence. This applies especially to mainland Greece, where the roots of the Greek language were deepest.

Thus one can conclude with some confidence that about 1500 B.C. Greece was invaded by a host of Greek-speaking tribes which

spread over the entire mainland, caused a violent break of its cultural growth, and reshaped the cultural patterns of its spiritual and material life. If we assume that the "coming of the Greeks" has left adequate archaeological traces, it is at this point in time and in the cultural development of the Aegean world that it must be located.⁵¹

If we accept this interpretation of the archaeological evidence at our disposal – and this is the view most widely held among specialists – the historical frame of all that can be known about the Pre-Greek linguistic stratum is constituted by the Neolithic and Early Bronze Age culture of Greece and the Aegean. We thus reach a time much more ancient than students of Pre-Greek linguistics were traditionally inclined to believe.

And yet, it was already in the Early Bronze Age that the foundations of the Aegean culture were laid. The results of modern archaeology and the decipherment of Linear B do not therefore relegate Pre-Greek studies to the outer limbo of a remote time depth that makes its subject shadowy and historically meaningless. As inadequate as our information on this subject may be, this subject is nothing less than the study of the linguistic medium or media of the first full-grown cultural achievements in the Aegean world. The whole further cultural development of the Aegean has been profoundly influenced and shaped by this initial stage whose main features were urbanity and sea-faring, features so essential for Classical Greece and for whatever it means to Europe and to the Modern World.

Recent research has shown that, in general, the time depth from which the history of individual Indo-European languages and language families can be followed is much greater than early comparatists were prone to assume. That the Pre-Greek linguistic stratum in the Aegean must be dated before ca. 1950 B.C. is in full accordance with this general picture.

⁵¹ Cf. SCHACHERMEYR (1954: 1489–94) and A. WACE in VENTRIS-CHADWICK (1956: xx–); also BLEGEN (1928), TJUMENEV (1953).

2.3 THE PRE-GREEK LINGUISTIC STRATUM

2.3.1 *Opinions as to the affiliations of the ancient languages of Asia Minor*

When in the nineteenth century the genetic study of languages made its appearance and the areas of the established language families were put on the map, it was obvious even at first glance that the whole of Asia Minor constituted a blank. All available information on the languages spoken there in antiquity before the general Hellenization of the area was so scant that all attempt at genetic classification had to remain guesswork. It was first suggested that the ancient languages of Anatolia were Indo-European and that they belonged to the Indo-Iranian subfamily.⁵² This ill-founded hypothesis induced the great indologist Lassen to make the first serious attempt at an acceptable solution of the problem. He came to the conclusion that the area of Asia Minor was in antiquity divided between languages of the Indo-European and the Semitic family, the former being spoken in the north, the latter in the south.⁵³

Later on, the Indo-European area in Anatolia was presumed to be much larger since a certain scepticism prevailed with regard to Semitic languages in Asia Minor.⁵⁴

In more recent times the tendency arose to postulate in Anatolia autochthonous languages which belonged neither to the Indo-European nor to the Semitic family, but formed one of their own. The beginning was made, so it seems, by Kiepert, the great master

⁵² Cf. BÖTTCHER (1851).

⁵³ Cf. LASSEN (1856: 329–). According to LASSEN, Indo-European languages were spoken by the Phrygians, the Bithynians, the Paphlagonians, the Lycians, the Cappadocians and the Lycaonians, Semitic languages by the Carians, the Lydians, the Mysians, the Cilicians, the Solymians, the Pisidians, and the Isaurians.

⁵⁴ Cf. LAGARDE (1866: 243–); he assigned the Carians, the Lydians, and the Mysians to the Indo-European speaking group of the population of that area.

of ancient geography.⁵⁵ From the frequent occurrence of Anatolian toponyms with the suffixes *-nd-* and *-ss-* (such as *Alabanda*, *Mormonda*, *Arykanda*, *Kalynda*, or *Lyrnessos*, *Myessos*, *Pitnissos*, *Telanissos*, to name only a few) he concluded that a linguistic stratum prior to Semitic and Indo-European immigrations had to be reckoned with in Asia Minor. Similar views were expressed by other scholars too.⁵⁶ Finally, Kretschmer provided the authoritative version of this theory which dominated linguistic opinion in this matter for many decades.⁵⁷

According to Kretschmer the Phrygians were the only people in ancient Anatolia that spoke an Indo-European language. And they were relative newcomers in the area just as the Greeks were after them. There were no Semitic languages spoken by peoples of Asia Minor. All languages except Phrygian were related to one another and belonged to a separate family.

This teaching remained undisputed until Hrozný succeeded in 1915 in deciphering Hittite texts from the archives of Boğazköy, and the ancient Indo-European languages of Anatolia (Hittite, Luwian, and Palaian) were discovered. They form a separate group among the Indo-European languages. Since then the label *Anatolian* has been reserved for them. This discovery destroyed the general confidence in Kretschmer's teaching about the ancient languages of Asia Minor, since it proved that Indo-European languages had been used in the area long before the time Kretschmer had deemed likely.

2.3.2 The language indicated by Pre-Greek suffixes

The scholarly opinions on the linguistic situation in ancient Asia Minor were of fundamental importance for the views that were formed on the Pre-Greek linguistic stratum in the Aegean area. Pott was, as far as we know, the first to draw attention to the toponyms that testify to the existence of a Pre-Greek language in

⁵⁵ Cf. KIEPERT (1878: 73, 90).

⁵⁶ Cf. THRAEMER (1888: 180, 340), TOMASCHEK (1892: 1).

⁵⁷ Cf. KRETSCHMER (1896: 292-).

Greece.⁵⁸ This was especially obvious of the place names with the characteristic suffix *-nth-* which corresponds to *-nd-* in Asia Minor. His suggestions were further developed by Pauly who composed the first lists of such names.⁵⁹ Pauly also believed that the Pre-Greek language represented by these toponyms was closely related to the autochthonous languages of Asia Minor and with the older linguistic stratum of Italy as known from the Etruscan monuments. On this basis, in addition to fundamental research of his own, Kretschmer constructed his doctrine which was to influence basically all teaching and research for many decades to come.⁶⁰

According to Kretschmer, the Pre-Greek language was one and showed no essential variety. It belonged to the same family as the autochthonous languages of Asia Minor. This language family, neither Indo-European nor Semitic, had originally spread to the Aegean and the south of the Balkan peninsula. The suffix *-nth-* is but the western variant of the suffix *-nd-* found in Asia Minor. The Pre-Greek stratum of the Aegean area was, as Kretschmer thought, one, non-Indo-European, and closely related to the autochthonous languages of Asia Minor. Fick provided further evidence for this view.⁶¹

Kretschmer's teaching on the Pre-Greek substratum in the Aegean is based chiefly on the study of geographical names of non-Greek origin. For the study of Pre-Greek they remained the principal source until the present day. Non-Greek texts are very scarce and have not yet been deciphered and interpreted. They are therefore useless for this purpose. These Pre-Greek monuments are: the Cretan texts written in the Hieroglyphic and the Linear A script, the stele of Lemnos, and the inscriptions in Greek characters from Praisos on Crete. Some non-Greek inscriptions in the indigenous script have been found also on Cyprus.⁶²

Here we shall present the onomastic material which formed the

⁵⁸ Cf. POTT (1853: 451).

⁵⁹ Cf. PAULY (1886: 47-).

⁶⁰ Cf. KRETSCHMER (1896: 401-; 1927: 68-75), HUBER (1921), Kronasser (1960).

⁶¹ Cf. FICK (1905, 1909).

⁶² These Pre-Greek Aegean texts will be considered on p. 95-6.

basis for Kretschmer's doctrine and was supplemented by other scholars, such as Schachermeyr⁶³ and Gindin.⁶⁴ The geographic distribution of these names was studied by Haley.⁶⁵

Among the classical names of mountains, rivers, cities, and other localities in ancient Greece, there is a wealth of those which cannot be explained as Greek words. It happens that these geographic names have in many cases characteristic suffixal elements, that is: *-nth-* *-s(s)-/ -tt-* *-n-* *-m-* *-mn-* *-l-* *-r-* *-th-*. The vowel that precedes the consonantal elements varies from name to name, and they differ also with respect to the way in which they are integrated into the system of Greek declension.

The most characteristic Pre-Greek suffixal element is *-nth-*. Place names containing it are mostly quite obviously non-Greek. They are found over the whole of the Aegean area, as opposed to *-nd-* in Asia Minor:

Ἀμάρυθος	— a township on Euboea
Ἀράκυνθος	— mountains in Aetolia, Boeotia, and Attica
Βερέκυνθος	— a mountain on Crete
Βρένθη	— a township in Arcadia
Ἐρύμανθος	— a mountain, a river, and a town in Arcadia
Ζάκυνθος	— an island in the Ionian sea; old name of Paros and Delos
Κήρινθος	— a town on Euboea
Κόρινθος	— a city on the Peloponnesian Isthmus
Κόσκυνθος	— a river on Euboea
Λαβύρινθος	— the Labyrinth on Crete
Λαρύνθιος	— an epithet of Zeus after a locality <i>*Larynthos</i>
Λέβινθος	— an island in the Sporades

⁶³ Cf. SCHACHERMEYR (1954: 1494–). The best manuals for such research are PAPE – BENSELER (1959) and HANSEN (1957); cf. also SCHERER (1965).

⁶⁴ Cf. GINDIN (1967: 53–).

⁶⁵ Cf. HALEY (1928).

Οἰάνθη	— a town in Locris Ozolia
Πάλυνθος	— a necropolis in Argos
Πρεπέσυνθος	— an island in the Cyclades
Προβάλινθος	— a township in Attica
Πύρανθος	— a township on Crete
Σαλύνθιος	— the name of a ruler in Acarnania derived from a place name <i>*Salynthos</i> .
Σάμινθος	— a locality in Argolis
Σίκυνθος	— an island in the Sporades
Σύρινθος	— a town on Crete
Τίρυνς	— a town in Argolis
gen. Τίρυνθος	
Τρικόρυνθος	— a demos in Attica
Υάκινθος	— a mountain in Attica, a demos on Tenos, an ancient deity in Laconia
Φάλανθος	— a mountain and a locality in Arcadia

The antiquity of these names is beyond doubt. Many of them can be found in Mycenaean texts and Homeric poems.

Another characteristic Pre-Greek suffixal element is *-ss-*. Place names of this category are much more frequent than those with *-nth-* (70 : 28); our list will only give some examples. In Attica this element has the form *-tt-*, a special development found in other words, too (cf. Ionian τάσσω: Attic τάττω; Ionian πρήσσω: Attic πράττω):

Ἀμβρυς (σ)ος	— a town in Phocis, a river in Thessaly
Ἀμισός	— the harbour of Cnossos on Crete
Ἀρδηττός	— a hill in Attica
Βένκασος	— a river on Crete
Βόλις(σ)ος	— a town on Chios
Βριλησ(σ)ός	— a mountain in Attica
Γαργηττός	— a demos in Attica
Διφρωσσός	— a mountain on Euboea
Ἰάλυσος	— a city on Rhodos
Ἰλισσός	— a river in Attica

Ἰμβρασ(σ)ος	— a river on Samos, and the island itself
Κηφισ(σ)ός	— rivers in Phocis, Attica, Argolis, on Salamis and Scyros
Κνωσσός	— a city on Crete
Λάρισ(σ)α	— three towns in Thessaly, one in Attica, one in Argolis, two on Crete, one on Lesbos
Λαρύσιον	— a mountain in Laconia
Λάρισος	— a river in Achaea
Λεμησ(σ)ός	— a town on Cyprus
Λυκαβηττός	— a hill in Attica
Μάρπησσαν	— a mountain on Paros
Μυκαλυσσός	— a town in Boeotia
Παγασαί	— a town in Thessaly
Πήδασος	— a town in Messenia
Πάμισος	— a river in Messenia
Πανισός	— a river in Thessaly
Παρνασσός	— a mountain in Phocis
Παρράσιοι	— a town in Arcadia
Περμησός	— a river in Boeotia
Πύρασος	— a town in Thessaly
Πραισός	— a town on Crete
Συπαληττός	— a demos in Attica
Σφηττός	— a demos in Attica
Ταφιασός	— mountains in Locris and Aetolia
Τερμησός	— a river in Boeotia
Τευμησός	— a town and a mountain in Boeotia
Τίασσα	— a river in Laconia
Τιταρήσιος	— a river in Thessaly
Τυλισσός	— a town on Crete
Υγίτος	— a village in Boeotia
Υμηττός	— a mountain in Attica
Χαμβρίτρασον	— a locality on Crete

Place names with this suffixal element are very frequent also in Asia Minor. Their area encompasses the whole of Anatolia, the

southern Balkans, and the Aegean. It coincides fully with the area of the place names with the suffixal elements *-nth-* and *-nd-*, respectively.

Another suffixal element frequent in Pre-Greek toponyms is *-n-*. Here are some examples:

Ἀθῆναι	— Athens
Ἀΐγινα	— an island in the Saronic gulf
Αἰσών	— a river in lower Macedonia
Ἀλπηνός	— a town in Locris
Ἀσίνη	— towns in Argolis, Laconia, Messenia, and on Cyprus
Βέλβινα	— an island in the Saronic gulf, and a town in Laconia
Βήνη	— a town on Crete
Γόρτυνα	— towns on Crete and in Arcadia
Γορτυνία	— town in Macedonia
Θήρην	— a river on Crete
Ἰτανός	— a town on Crete, mountains on Crete
Καῦνος	— a town on Crete
Λεβήνα	— a town on Crete
Λέρνη	— a lake and a town in Argolis, a spring near Corinth
Μέθανα	— a town in Argolis
Μεθώνη	— a town in Messenia and in Macedonia
Μιτυλήνη	— a city on Lesbos
Μυκῆναι	— towns in Argolis and on Crete
Μύκονος	— an island in the Cyclades
Μύρινα	— towns on Crete and on Lemnos
Πάνων	— a mountain in Laconia
Σαλαμίς	— an island in the Saronic gulf, and a city
gen. Σαλαμῆνος	on Cyprus
Σαλμών	— a town in Thessaly
Σαλμώνη	— a spring and a town in Elis
Σαλμώνιον	— a mountain range on Crete

Σούνιον	— the cape of Attica, a mountain on Paros
Τευθρώνη	— a town in Laconia
Τῆνος	— an island in the Cyclades
Τροιζήν	— a town in Argolis
Ὑσσελινον	— a mountain in Argolis

Here are some examples of the suffixal element *-m-* in Pre-Greek place names:

Κίσσαμος	— a town on Crete
Κύαμον	— a mountain on Crete
Πέργαμον	— a town on Crete, the fortification of Ilion, a city in Asia Minor

The suffixal element *-mn-* is somewhat more frequent:

Λάρυμνα	— towns in Boeotia and Locris
Λεπέτυμνος	— a mountain on Lesbos
Λῆμνος	— an island in the Aegean
Μήθυμνα	— a town on Lesbos
<i>Ordymnus</i>	— a mountain on Lesbos
Πρόσυμνα	— a locality in Argolis
Ῥίθυμνα	— a town on Crete
Σέδαμνος	— a river on Crete
Σέλαμνος	— a river on Crete
Σέλεμνος	— a river in Achaea

Examples for the suffixal element *-l-* in Pre-Greek place names are:

Ἀστάλη	— a locality on Crete
Καρδαμύλη	— a town in Laconia
Κασταλία	— a spring in Phocis
Κίμωλος	— an island of the Cyclades
Κνόκαλος	— a mountain in Arcadia
Σκανδίλη	— an island in the Northern Aegean

Examples for the suffixal element *-r-* in Pre-Greek place names are:

Ἀσσωρόν	— a mountain on Samos
Ἀτάβυρον	— a mountain on Rhodos
Βρυγίνδαρα	— a locality on Rhodos
Δρῆρος	— a town on Crete
Ἐλυρος	— a town on Crete
Ἐπίδαυρος	— towns in Argolis and Laconia
Ἐφύρα	— older name of Corinth and Crannon in Thessaly, also of Cichyros in Epirus, towns in Elis, Aetolia and Perrhaebia
Ἰκαρία	— an island of the Aegean
Κάμειρος	— a city on Rhodos
Κησκώρα	— a locality on Crete
Κύθηρα	— an island of the Aegean
Κύθηρος	— a river in Elis, a town in Attica
Τεγύραι	— a town in Boeotia
Τίταρον	— a town in Thessaly
Τιτάριον	— a mountain in Thessaly
Ὠλερος	— a town on Crete

Examples for the suffixal element *-th-* in Pre-Greek place names are:

Αἶνηθος	— a mountain
Κάνηθος	— a mountain on Euboea
Κικύνηθος	— an island of the Aegean
Πάρνης	— a mountain in Attica
gen. Πάρνηθος	
Πεπάρηθος	— an island of the Cyclades
Σκίαθος	— an island of the Cyclades
Ὑρνήθιοι	— a locality near Epidaurus

Without being complete, these name lists show how characteristic types of derivation can be established, connected by an impressive correlation with toponyms without a Greek etymology and of supposed Pre-Greek origin. It must be stressed that these

types of name formation are significant because of the relatively high frequency of the names representing them, whereas every single name in the lists cannot but be very problematic. All these suffixal elements are quite normal and frequent also in Greek words with the only exception of *-nth-*. Thus *Αἴγινα* can easily be a derivation of Greek *αἴξ* 'goat', *Μυκῆναι* can be understood as a derivation of Greek *μύκαι* 'mushrooms', *Μέθανα* and *Μεθώνη* as a derivation of *μέθυ* 'wine'. *Ποικιλασσός* may be derived from Greek *ποικίλος* 'variegated', and *Παγασαί* from *πάγος* 'cliff'. Undoubtedly Greek are the toponyms *Ἀμφισσα*, *Ἀντισσα*, *Ἀστρασός*, and *Μυγαλωσσός*. And even *-nth-*, which is more characteristic Pre-Greek, occurs in Greek words also: cf. *μίνυνθα* 'a little' and *κῆρινθος* 'wax bread'.

It is almost impossible to discern in every single case the real etymology and derivation from paretymological adaptations. And the combination of modern scholars are sometimes very similar to the boldest folk etymologies. It is therefore impossible to be certain for every place name whether it is Pre-Greek or Greek, or perhaps of some other provenience. A secondary productivity of suffixes containing these elements must also be reckoned with. Once firmly established in Greek onomastics, these derivational types were productive wherever foreign names had to be adapted to the Greek language. Names of this group were thus to be found from the extreme West (cf. *Ταρτησσός* in Spain) to the East (cf. *Ῥάμανθα* in Syria) where they are to be regarded as traces of Greek contacts with a foreign toponymy and not as derived from the same substratum which the speakers of Greek had met in the Aegea area.⁶⁶

And yet, the antiquity of these derivational types and their Pre-Greek chronology cannot be doubted in the least. They appear in toponyms that are attested in the oldest documents, from Asia Minor, in the Assyrian texts of Kültepe. Here place names occur of all the established types of Pre-Greek derivation: *Purušhatum*

⁶⁶ Cf. KRETSCHMER (1896: 402–3), GINDIN (1967: 57, 63, 67–9), and DEROY (1956).

(in Hittite texts *Purušhanda*), *Ninaša*, *Zupana*, *Tegarama*, *Haršamna*, *Simala*, *Kušara*. These texts must be dated no later than the 19th century B.C., and the suffixes were thus already frequent in the toponymy of Asia Minor at a time when Greek-speaking tribes had only appeared on the mainland of Greece.⁶⁷

In Hittite and Luwian texts found in the archives of Boğazköy, many toponyms of the same derivational type appear. But there these toponyms are no isolated relics, as they are in Greek, but can in many cases, in spite of the fragmentary state of our documentation, be connected with the appellative vocabulary of the Indo-European languages of ancient Anatolia:

-nd-:	<i>Arlanda</i>	<i>arla-nuwa-</i> a Luwian verb
	<i>Irhandā</i>	Hitt. <i>irha-</i> 'border'
	<i>Kuranda</i>	Hitt. <i>kuer-</i> 'cut', <i>kuera-</i> 'field, grove'
	<i>Partanta</i>	Luw. <i>parti-</i> 'side'
-ss-:	<i>Tappaššanda</i>	Luw. <i>tappaš-ant</i> 'sky'
	<i>Wannanda</i>	Luw. <i>wanni-</i> 'stony hole'
	<i>Alpaššija</i>	Hitt. <i>alpa-</i> 'cloud'
	<i>Irhašša</i>	Hitt. <i>irha-</i> 'border'
	<i>Parnašša</i>	Luw. <i>parna-</i> 'house' (cf. <i>Παρνασσός</i> in Greece)
	<i>Petašša</i>	Hitt. <i>peda-</i> 'place' (cf. <i>Πήδαρος</i> in Caria)
	<i>Šallešša</i>	Hitt. <i>šalli-</i> 'big'

In Luwian, possessive forms were derived by means of a productive suffix *-ašši*. Adjectives, thus formed, were used instead of genitive forms of substantives. Cf. Luwian

maššana- 'god' : *maššanašši-* 'belonging to the god'
tijammi- 'earth' : *tijammašši-* 'belonging to the earth'.

⁶⁷ Cf. GOETZE (1967: 67–), KRONASSER (1963: 128–); cf. also GAMKRELIDZE (1956).

In a great many ancient Anatolian toponyms the element *-ss-* can be explained as a part of this suffix.

- n-: *Luwana* the Anatolian ethnonym *Luwi-*
Paḫurina Hitt. *paḫhur*; Luw. *paḫur* 'fire'
Urauna Hitt. and Luw. *ura-* 'big'
 -m-: *Dukkama* Hitt. *dug-* 'appear'
 -mn-: *Hattušumna* 'a man from Hattuša'
Palaumna 'a man from Pala'
Luiumna 'a man from Luwia'
Halpum(n)a 'a man from Aleppo'
 -l-: *Imralla* Luw. *imra-* 'steppe'

The same derivational patterns obtain in the Anatolian appellative vocabulary also:

- nt-: Hitt. *gim-* 'winter': *gimmant-* 'winter'
 Hitt. *peruna-* 'rock': *perunant-* 'rocky'
 -ss-: Luw. *tijammi-* 'earth': *tijamašši-* 'belonging to the earth'
 Luw. *maššani-* 'god': *maššanijašši-* 'belonging to the god'
 -n-: Hitt. *ḫink-* 'die': *ḫenkan-* 'death'
 Hitt. *naḫ-* 'be afraid': *naḫhan-* 'fear'
 -m-: Hitt. *ekuna* 'cold (adj.)': *ekunima-* 'cold (noun)'
 Hitt. *tethâi-* 'to thunder': *tethima-* 'thunder'
 -l-: Hitt. *wašta-* 'to sin': *waštul-* 'a sin'
 Hitt. *karimni-* 'shrine': *karimnala* 'servant of a shrine'
 -r-: Hitt. *anija-* 'to guide': *aniur-* 'religious guidance'

So there can not be the slightest doubt that these characteristic types of toponomastic suffixes were integrated into Anatolian derivation and have therefore in such cases to be regarded as Indo-European.⁶⁸

This full correspondence between the derivational types of the Pre-Greek toponyms with the derivation of Anatolian toponyms

⁶⁸ Cf. FRIEDRICH (1952-54), GOETZE (1953, 1960, 1962), LAROCHE (1947, 1957, 1959, 1961), GINDIN (1967: 72-9).

and appellatives can hardly be regarded as due to pure chance. And yet, the correspondence of consonantal elements in suffixes alone is not enough to guarantee a real linguistic connection.⁶⁹ It is therefore important to show that the Pre-Greek toponyms with the characteristic suffixes form really a coherent system of derivation. Even our evidence, scattered and fragmentary as it is, allows us to reconstruct some rudimental traces of precisely such a system:⁷⁰

-nθ-	-σσ-	-ν-	-μ-	-μν-	-λ-	-ρ-
Λάρυνθος	Λάρισα			Λάρυννα		
Πύρανθος, Πύρωνδος	Πύρασος					
Αἶγυνθος	Αἶγισσος	Αἶγυνη			Αἶγυλα	Αἶγυρος
	Τιτύασσος, Τιταρησσός					Τίτυρος, Τιταρησ- σός, Τίταρος
	Τεμησσός					Τέμερρα
	Ἐφεσσος					Ἐφύρα
	Ὀρβαλισσηγή Ὀρβάνασσα	Ὀρβ·λίσ- σηγή Ὀρβά- νασσα			Ὀρβηλος Ὀρβηλος	
	Κυδρησσός	Κυδρήνη				Κύδραρα
	Καρμυλησσός				Καρμυ- λησσός, Καρδα- μύλη	

⁶⁹ SCHACHERMEYR (1954: 1510) quotes BRANDENSTEIN who had pointed out in a conversation that many African geographic names by this criterion belong to the Pre-Greek and ancient Anatolian stratum (cf. *Uganda, Wagunda, Ruanda, Burundi, Kirundu*).

⁷⁰ Cf. SCHACHERMEYR (1954: 1511-).

—νθ—	—σσ—	—ν—	—μ—	—μν—	—λ—	—ρ—
	Ἰμβρυσος		Ἰμβρυσ- μος			
	Θυεσσός		Θύγμις			
	Μυκαλησσός	Μυκαῖναι			Μυκα- λησσός, Μυκάλη	
	Κορησσός	Κορήνη				
	Ὀρδησσός			Ὀρδυ- μνος		
	Σήδασα			Σήδαμνος		
	Τυμνησσός, Ἀρτυμνησσός			Τυμνησ- σός, Ἀρτυ- μνησσός Τύμνος		
					Ἄστυλι	Ἄστυρα
					Κύδρηλος	Κύδρηρα

Pre-Greek toponymy forms thus part of a derivational system found also in of ancient Anatolia, a system which has been shown to be fully integrated into the nominal derivation system of the Indo-European languages of the Anatolian group (Hittite and Luwian). Yet this does not mean that the language whose derivational patterns are reflected by the toponyms adduced above, if their derivationlike relations are not pure coincidence, is by necessity Anatolian and Indo-European. The presence of these derivational types in the toponyms of the Cappadocian texts from Kültepe make such a conclusion rather problematic. Moreover, Hester has demonstrated that place names with sufficiently distinctive Pre-Greek suffixes (-nth-, -nd-, -mn-) show also a distinctive phonemic root pattern: a strong preference for open syllables and in particular an almost total absence of medial consonant clusters beginning with a stop. The -ss- and -nt- names are less distinctive and the alleged

single-letter suffixes not distinctive at all. A non-Indo-European language of the suffixes can thus reasonably be postulated, although the current lists of place names with characteristic suffixes contain definitely too much material: many names do not belong to the language in question.⁷¹

The suffixal elements, characteristic for the Pre-Greek toponyms and corresponding with Anatolian derivational types, occur also in many Greek words that cannot be explained by a Greek etymology and usually denote plants, animals, and material objects that belong to the Aegean flora, fauna, and material culture:

αἴγινθος	'name of a bird'
ἄσάμινθος	'stone bath tub'
ἄψινθιον	'wormwood'
βόλινθος	'European bison'
ἐρέβινθος	'a kind of beans'
λέβινθος	'a kind of beans'
μίνθη	'mint'
ἔλυνθος	'unripe or wild fig'
πέρινθα acc.	'the basket of a charriot'
(σ)μήρινθος	'tape'
κόρυνθος	'barley bread'
σμίνθος	'a mouse'
τερέβινθος	'terpentine'
βόνασος	'a buffalo'
θάλασσα	'sea'
θίασος	'procession'
κέρασος	'cherry tree'
κυπάρισσος	'cypress'
κύτισος	'Medicago arborea'
νάρκισσος	'narcissus'
νύσσα	'cone'
πίσσος	'beans'
ύσσός	'lance'

⁷¹ Cf. HESTER (1957; 1968: 221).

βάλανος	'acorn'
βαῦνος	'furnace'
δάφνη	'laurel'
εἰρήνη	'peace'
κάμινος	'furnace'
κάστανον	'chestnut'
κύανος	'blue stone'
κίνδυνος	'danger'
ὀρίγανον	'an acid herb, origanum'
σαγήνη	'net'
θάλαμος	'room'
κάλαμος	'reed'
κέραμος	'clay'
κύαμος	'bean'
αἰσυμνάω	'I order'
θέλυμα	'foundations'
αἰγίθαλλος	'a bird'
ἀρύβαλλος	'kind of bottle'
αἷστος	'wicked'
ἔξαλος	'wild goat'
ἔξαλη	'a goat's skin'
φιάλη	'vessel'
καθαρός	'pure'
κασσίτερος	'tin'
κιθάρα	'guitar'
λάπαθον	'Rumex acetosa'
λήκυθος	'a vessel'
λέκιθος	'a food'
ψίαθος	'wicker work of reed'

This is only about a third of the existing material that could be presented here as an example. These appellatives, in general of non-Greek origin and connected by their content with the old Aegean culture, show clearly that the derivational types with the characteristic suffixal elements belong to a definite foreign layer in the Greek vocabulary. The fact that this layer is so well represented among place names shows that it is a Pre-Greek layer since toponymy is the most conservative part of a vocabulary. Among the Pre-Greek geographic names there are not only oronyms and hydronyms, but also a quite considerable number of names of cities and towns. From this fact can be concluded that the speakers of Greek found at their arrival the Aegean urbanization already in full development. This observation fits well with the inference from archaeological evidence according to which the first peak of urban life in the Aegean World was reached already in the Early Bronze Age, whereas Greek-speaking tribes invaded the area only at the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age.

The relation between the Pre-Greek language of the suffixes and Anatolian Indo-European remains intriguing and obscure. Either one has to admit that the far-reaching correspondence is due to pure chance, and thus without any historical relevance, or we must suppose that the toponymy of the Cappadocian texts was already Anatolian Indo-European which implies a change in the current chronologies of Indo-European immigration to Asia Minor. This complex problem cannot be further discussed here, the more so as the linguistic interpretation of the toponymy of the texts from Kül-tepe has not reached fully dependable and generally accepted results. Whatever the outcome of the discussion, it will be highly relevant for Pre-Greek linguistics.

2.3.3 *Non-Indo-European substratum words in the Eastern Mediterranean*

The doctrine according to which Greek and Italic spread to the south superseding a non-Indo-European substratum, thus forming Indo-European outposts in a world originally foreign as to both

language and culture, was fostered independently of the theories presented in the preceding chapter by the fact that a number of words denoting objects belonging to the Mediterranean world can best be explained as loans from such a substratum. Meillet and Cuny demonstrated that certain appellatives occur both in Indo-European languages (especially Greek and Latin) and in non-Indo-European languages (especially Semitic) without obvious native etymologies in any one of them and in a form which usually rules out borrowing from one of these languages into others. It can therefore be safely presumed that they are common loans from some non-attested language or languages.⁷²

Such words are:

μόλυβδος	<i>plumbum</i> 'lead'	Basque <i>berun</i> 'lead'
ῥάκινθος	'hyacinth' <i>vaccinium</i>	'vaccinium myrtillus'
κυπάρισσος	<i>cupressus</i> 'cypress'	Hebrew <i>gofer</i> 'cypress'
μίνθος	<i>menta</i> 'mint'	
ῥόδον	<i>rosa</i> 'rose'	Armenian <i>vard</i> , Aramaic <i>vardā</i> 'rose'
λείριον	<i>lilium</i> 'lily'	Egyptian <i>hrr-t</i> , Coptic <i>hreri</i> , <i>hleli</i> , 'lily'
σῦκον	<i>figus</i> 'fig'	Armenian <i>tuz</i> 'fig'
οἶνος	<i>vīnum</i> 'wine'	Hittite <i>winija-</i> , Armenian <i>gini</i> , Albanian <i>venë</i> , Ethiopian <i>wain</i> , Hebrew <i>jajin</i> 'wine'
ἑρέβινθος	<i>ervum</i> 'chick-pea'	Old Indic <i>aravindam</i> 'a lotus'
θώραξ	<i>lorica</i> 'cuirass'	
μύρμηξ	<i>formica</i> 'ant'	

There is nothing to prove a connection between the language of these loan words and the language of the Pre-Greek suffixes. Both are established quite separately. And yet the results of these investigations suggest strongly a non-Indo-European substratum for the Greek language.

⁷² Cf. MEILLET (1908-09), CUNY (1910), HESTER (1968: 223-4).

Georgiev and other "Pelagianists" have shown that Indo-European etymologies can be constructed for these words if the freedom is taken to assume new sets of sound laws belonging to a presumed extinct Indo-European language (cf. below p. 73-5). But even then the etymologies are far from obvious, and mostly far-fetched and very hypothetical and tentative. Nor can a single set of sound laws be applied to all these words. No wonder then that even the supporters of an Indo-European interpretation of these words disagree on the etymologies to be given to them. Their labour has thus proved only the possibility to construct Indo-European etymologies for the words in question. From this fact we learn very little about their affiliations, more perhaps about how easy it is to give a more or less far-fetched Indo-European etymology by combining roots and suffixes from diverse languages and taking phonetic and semantic liberties.

One must thus remain sceptical and agnostic as to the source of this lexical stratum. It has often been called *Mediterranean*, but this label is confusing because the words have been established quite independently of the "Mediterranean theories" that suppose a more or less united Pre-Indo-European substratum for the whole Mediterranean. The only thing we can take for granted is that the words under consideration bear witness to Mediterranean cultural loan contacts which are not transparent to us.

2.3.4 "Protindogermanisch"

With Hrozný's decipherment of the Hittite documents in 1915 one of the two basic assumptions on which the edifice of Kretschmer's doctrine rested had lost much of its convincing power. His belief that the uniform linguistic stratum covering the Pre-Greek Aegean and Anatolia was non-Indo-European ceased to be obviously plausible since Indo-European languages such as Hittite and Luwian had come to be known in Ancient Anatolia in such a remote past as the second millennium B.C. Arguments for an Indo-European affiliation of such languages as Etruscan, Lycian, Lydian, and Carian were brought forth which could no longer be completely dis-

regarded.⁷³ Kretschmer was himself strongly impressed and influenced by these discoveries and he began to change his views. He no longer thought that the Greeks were the first Indo-Europeans in Greece and the Archipelago, but believed that they were preceded there by others who spoke Indo-European languages of an older type than the reconstructed proto-language of the historically known Indo-European languages. Kretschmer called it *Protindogermanisch* or *Proto-Indo-European*, in a sense which differs from the current Anglo-Saxon usage of this term that commonly denotes the Indo-European proto-language and not older phases of its history prior to the disintegration.⁷⁴

Kretschmer came to believe that traces of his *Protindogermanisch* stratum can be detected in the Greek vocabulary. In the first place it is the second name of the Dioscuri, *Τινδαρίδαι*, which is to be explained, according to him, as a Pre-Greek designation with the meaning 'sons of Zeus'; *Διόσκουροι* would then be the Greek translation. The first part of this Pre-Greek name (*Τιν-*) corresponds to Etruscan *Tin*, *Tins*, and *Tinia*, all forms of the Etruscan name of Juppiter. *Tin-* is according to this etymology a *Protindogermanisch* cognate of IE **dino-* (cf. Lat. *nun-dinum* 'nine days', OI *dinam*, OCS *dnъ* 'day'), whereas in the personal name *Τευδάρεως* the apophonic form with a diphthong can be recognized (IE **dyēu* : OI *dyaus* 'heaven'; Gr. *Ζεύς*). The languages of the *Protindogermanisch* stratum have thus an un-voiced stop for an Indo-European voiced one. Kretschmer explains the second element (*-δαρ-*) as a patronymic suffix comparable to Etruscan *-thur* in the names *vel* : *velthur* and, latinized, *Numa* : *Numitor*.

Another *Protindogermanisch* word is *τιτώ* 'the dawn' with which the mythological names *Τιτώ* and *Τιθωνός* are to be connected. These forms are, according to Kretschmer, cognates of IE **dito-* : Alb. *ditē* 'day', OI *-dītis* 'light'. Other lexical items of the same stratum can be identified with less certainty: one is *θάλος* 'shoot' which is etymologically connected by Kretschmer with the name of the

⁷³ For the arguments, cf. MERIGGI (1936a, 1936b), PALLOTINO (1955: 235-6).

⁷⁴ Cf. KRETSCHMER (1925a).

Etruscan goddess *Θalna*; another one, *ιερός*, *ιαρός* 'sacred' which is in the same way connected with Etr. *aisar* 'god'.⁷⁵

In the course of time Kretschmer arrived at a complete revision of his doctrine: he assumed an encroachment of two Pre-Greek linguistic strata in the Aegean: one *Protindogermanisch* and the other Micrasiatic non-Indo-European. He called them the *Anatolian* and the *Danubian stratum*.⁷⁶ According to this view, all Pre-Greek place names that recur in Asia Minor (such as *Λαβύρινθος* on Crete and *Λάβραυνδος* in Caria; or *Πήδασος* in Messenia and *Πήδασος* in Caria; *Μίλατος* on Crete and *Μίλητος* on the coast of Asia Minor) belong to the Micrasiatic layer which is to be connected with the ancient tradition about the Lelegian autochthons. Archaeologically this stratum is to be identified with the marked influence from Asia Minor during the Early Bronze Age.

The Danubian layer is archaeologically identified by Kretschmer with the culture of Dimini and the migrations that brought its northern elements to Greece. To it belong the *Protindogermanisch* words in Greek vocabulary and the majority of place names with the characteristic Pre-Greek suffixal elements. It is connected with the ancient tradition about the Pelasgian autochthons. These Danubian Pelasgians were the bearers of the *Protindogermanisch* stratum as established before. Archaeologically this linguistic group can be identified, according to Kretschmer, with the people producing the so-called ribbon-ware (*Bandkeramik*).

Kretschmer's idea about the two Pre-Greek linguistic strata, one Danubian and the other Micrasiatic, is no doubt ingenious and has, as an intuition, to be taken seriously into consideration and must be carefully examined in every respect. But it is also obvious that the revised thesis of Kretschmer is based in the first place on archaeological evidence, all the linguistic data and arguments derived from it being secondary and subsidiary. The great migrations as defined by archaeological material are the basis of these constructions, and the linguistic data are selected and interpreted with this already estab-

⁷⁵ Cf. KRETSCHMER (1925a: 308-11; 1943: 88).

⁷⁶ Cf. KRETSCHMER (1940-43).

lished background in view. From the linguistic material available, only such examples are chosen which can be interpreted as fitting in one of the linguistic strata which were established by extralinguistic evidence.

There is another reason why Kretschmer's linguistic argumentation can hardly be accepted as well-founded and conclusive. It is because, without noticing it, he has left the sound fundamentals of comparative linguistics and etymological equation while seemingly applying the same methodological approach. The *Junggrammatiker* had never made quite explicit the real foundations of the comparative method which they had so successfully refined and usefully applied in linguistic research. It was therefore difficult to notice that between historical linguistics as practiced by them and the method introduced by Kretschmer there was an essential difference.

Although it was nowhere stated, a valid etymology as conceived by the school of the *Junggrammatiker* had a solid probabilistic foundation: by postulating exceptionless sound laws, a requirement was introduced that all historically relevant sound correspondences should be recurrent. Thus if an equation was based on recurring sound correspondences, the possibility that these correspondences were a product of pure chance was small, the smaller the more recurrent the correspondences were. The probability of chance was further reduced by the requirement that equated word-forms or parts of them should express a correspondent content. It was precisely this double security against chance similarity of word-forms that turned the comparative method into that tool of high precision as which it became known and renowned. Thus e.g. if Gr. καρδία is equated etymologically with Mod.E *heart*, it is not because there is a certain vague similarity between the two words which can be expressed in terms of a universal phonemic typology, but (a) because the correspondence of Gr. κ and δ with E. *h* and *t* recurs in a significantly large number of other equated pairs of words, (b) because the relation of E. *ear* to Gr. αἰ can also be reduced to a regular and recurring pattern, and (c) because the content of these words is correspondent to that extent that they translate each other in the most natural way.

The etymological equations by which Kretschmer tries to verify linguistically his supposed strata of the Pre-Greek population lack almost completely the probabilistic foundations that make etymology valid. Neither is there any recurrent phonemic correspondence between the supposed Pre-Greek word Τιν- and Etruscan *Tin-*, only a graphic similarity (in the variant form Τυνδαρίδαι this similarity becomes rather vague), nor is it by any means sure, or even really probable, that Τυνδαρίδαι/Τυνδαρίδαι translates the linguistic content of Διόσκουροι 'the sons of Zeus'. Kretschmer's assumption to that effect is nothing but just a simple possibility. It remains also to be seen whether -*dur* is really in Etruscan a patronymic suffix, since the decipherment of Etruscan has as yet led to only a few completely dependable results. If viewed in this way, Kretschmer's etymology of Τυνδαρίδαι, which in its main equation is taken from a contribution by Maresch,⁷⁷ will clearly appear to be very inadequately founded according to the standard introduced into comparative linguistics by the neogrammarians. And this etymology with its uncertain probabilistic basis is the key stone of Kretschmer's thesis about a *Protindogermanisch* stratum in the Pre-Greek Aegean.

A shaky linguistic construction does not become more solid if it is integrated into a historical frame based on archaeological evidence. It is, of course, highly significant when a far-reaching correspondence can be established between the data of comparative linguistics and history; cf. the Norman French elements in English and the historical information about the Norman Conquest. But such correspondences can only be established between data that are firmly based on their respective ground. A supposed correspondence cannot help make linguistic or historical evidence more certain than it is in itself. On closer scrutiny, it appears quite clearly that it is only the inventive brilliance of the author and the persuasiveness of the proposed historical frame that makes etymologies of the Kretschmerian type, when they are at their best, look plausible and conclusive. But if the real, although traditionally only implicit,

⁷⁷ Cf. MARESCH (1925).

criteria of etymological equations are taken into consideration, it is clear that the value of this kind of etymologies is very limited: they are at best mere possibilities. And this being so, we cannot evade the conclusion that Kretschmer's doctrine about a Danubian *Protindogermanisch* stratum in the Pre-Greek Aegean and its confrontation there with a non-Indo-European Anatolian one (Pelasgians *versus* Lelegians), whatever its merits from the archaeological and historical point of view, is based on very shaky linguistic foundations and is unacceptable as a general solution of the problem posed by the whole Pre-Greek complex.

This does not mean that the idea is not worth any further consideration. On the contrary, Kretschmer's intuition is stimulating, and recent research seems to confirm its basic correctness. But this does not change the fact that in his formulation and presentation the probabilistic foundation of valid etymology has been utterly neglected and the universally accepted approach of comparative linguistics only seemingly applied.

It was necessary to treat in some detail the methodological aspect of Kretschmer's doctrine because he was the founder and chief representative of a whole school in historical linguistics which influenced strongly all research in the field under consideration here. Teaching in Vienna, he quite naturally had a great influence on linguists working in the Balkans or studying its linguistic past. Most of them were, directly or indirectly, his pupils and it was therefore necessary to discuss at some length the method of approach he applied to the oldest linguistic history of the Balkans.

A scholar who followed Kretschmer in assuming a variety of Pre-Greek linguistic strata in the Aegean was W. Brandenstein, professor of linguistics in Graz. He thought that three Pre-Greek linguistic strata can be distinguished in the Aegean area, one of them Indo-European and two non-Indo-European but different from each other. Methodologically his approach does not differ essentially from Kretschmer's.

⁷⁸ Cf. BRANDENSTEIN (1935a, 1935b, 1950).

2.3.5 Pelastic

Another scholar with an important contribution to Pre-Greek studies is M. Budimir, professor emeritus of classical languages at the university of Belgrade. His contribution is important because of the interesting and stimulating ideas he has brought into the discussion and also because of his very extensive writing over a period of many decades. He believes that the Pre-Greek population of the Aegean area was very mixed ethnically and linguistically and that among this population there was also an Indo-European layer belonging to a special branch of this family in which all three series of velar stops (the palatals, the pure velars, and the labio-velars) were preserved as distinct phonemes. Such an Indo-European language is Albanian if Pedersen is right in postulating a sound law to the effect that Indo-European labio-velars are assibilated in Albanian before front vowels while pure velars remain unchanged in this position:

Alb. *pjek* 'I fry' < IE *pek^wō
 Alb. *pesë* 'five' < IE *penk^we
 Alb. *sy* 'eyes' < IE *ok^we

but

Alb. *kohë* 'time' < IE *kēsā

Albanian being a satem language with assibilated Indo-European palatal velars (cf. *vis* 'village': Lat. *vīcus*; *athëtë* 'sharp': Lat. *acer*; *lidhem* 'I am bound': Lat. *ligāre*; *zë*, definite *zëri* 'voice': OI *havanam* 'praising') it is apparent that, if Pedersen's conclusions are correct, Albanian is an Indo-European language which distinguishes three kinds of velar stops while the overwhelming majority of the others has merged the pure velars either with the palatals (*centum* languages) or with the labio-velars (*satem* languages).⁷⁹

⁷⁹ Cf. PEDERSEN (1900), JOKL (1963: 123-7), MANN (1952: 35-6), BARIĆ (1959: 21). Against this view and regarding Albanian as a simple satem-language: HERMANN (1907).

Pedersen's law is still under discussion and cannot yet be regarded as either accepted or rejected, but has to be taken into consideration with all due reserve.

Budimir accepts Pedersen's law and believes that Albanian, distinguishing the three series of Indo-European stops, continues the oldest linguistic stratum in the Balkan and that the Pre-Greek Indo-European language belonged to the same family. This he tries to prove by establishing Greek loan words of Pre-Greek origin which distinguish also the three kinds of Indo-European velar stops. According to Budimir, such loan words are for instance: *σεργός* 'deer': Lat. *cervus*, IE **kerwos* and *σαρμός* 'warm': Gr. *θερμός*, IE **g^hhermos*; they show an assibilation of both Indo-European palatals and labio-velars. Budimir therefore postulates a special relationship between the Pre-Greek Indo-European language and modern Albanian.⁸⁰ In this he follows von Hahn and Thomopoulos who thought that Albanian was a modern form of the ancient Pelasgian language.⁸¹ This thesis has most recently won strong support among modern Albanian scholars.⁸² Because of the relationship of Pre-Greek Indo-European and Albanian Budimir believes that they are both connected with Illyrian, the ancient Indo-European language of the North-West Balkans. He believes that in these regions, linguistic elements can be found which also show a distinction among the three original types of Indo-European velar stops. Thus he takes quite a wide field into consideration and tries to etymologize as many obscure words and names as possible, always reckoning with a lot of phonic variation resulting from alloglottic adaptations of these forms.

A very instructive example of this approach is the etymology and the cognations he proposed for the Epirotic gloss *δάξα* 'sea' with an attested variant form *δάψα*. Budimir connects this word with *ζάψ* 'surf' and with the name of the sea goddess *Θέτις* (from a supposed older form **Θέπιτις*). To the same word family belongs, according to him, also Albanian *det/dejet* 'sea'. All these words are

⁸⁰ Cf. BUDIMIR (1931; 1936: 198; 1950: 13-; 1951b: 81; 1957).

⁸¹ Cf. HAHN (1874), THOMOPOULOS (1912).

⁸² Cf. KONDA (1964), ÇABEJ (1964: 79-83).

etymologically explained by Budimir as different Illyrian and Pre-Greek derivations of IE **dheup/b-* 'deep' and cognates of Mod.E. *depth*.

To the same word family belongs also the name *Ὀδυσσεύς* /*Ulixes* meaning 'sea man', the initial *o/u* being a preposition, and *δυσσ/lix* being alloglottic adaptations of *δάξα* 'sea' (the supposed original form of *Ὀδυσσεύς* being *Ὀδυσεύς*). Semantic equivalents are Gr. *ἐφαλος* 'being on the sea' and Serbo-Croatian *pomorac* 'sea man'.

The meaning 'sea' is secondary in the words derived from this Indo-European root. The original meaning is preserved in other words belonging to the same Pre-Greek Indo-European stratum. It had spread even to Italy and Asia Minor. An example is, according to Budimir, the gloss *δύβρις* 'trench' and the famous Roman hydronym *Tiberis* (with the variant forms *Thy(m)bris* and *Dybris*). A further cognate is *Σύβαρις* which denotes a monster that lived in a deep hole.

With this same word family, Budimir also connects a number of supposed Pre-Greek appellative nouns with considerable alloglottic adaptations in their sound pattern. Such words are

Gr. σίμβλος	'beehive': Lit. <i>dumblas</i>	SCr <i>duplja</i> 'hole in a tree'
σιπύη	'meal-tub'	SCr <i>dubenica</i> 'beehive'
δέπας	'beaker'	SCr <i>dupe</i> 'arse'
δέπαστρον	'beaker'	OCS <i>dobro</i> 'valley'
ἀλάβαστρον/ἀλάβαστρος	'globular vase without handles for holding perfumes'	
λαβρώνιον	'large wide cup'	
λεπαστή	'limpet-shaped drinking-cup'	
λοβός	'lobe'	
λάβιρος	'hole'	
λέβης	'kettle'	
Λαβύρινθος	'Labyrinth' ⁸³	Lit. <i>dauburyš</i> 'valley'

⁸³ BUDIMIR (1959d) changed his mind and explained it as: *λα-* augmentative prefix, *-βυρ-* as in *βυριον* 'house', and *-ινθος* IE collective suffix. So the real meaning would be 'the very many buildings'.

σέβις	'box'
συρβός	'trench'

In these equations we have to reckon with an alternation *d/l* as in δάφνη/λάφνη 'laurel', further with the alternations *d/s* and *d/z*, with a monophthongization of *eu* to *e* and *au* to *a*, and with a change of *e* to *a* and in addition to all that with a total disregard of the distinctions between voiced and voiceless, between aspirated and un-aspirated stops. A prefix *α-* can also be freely added to every word. It is evident that on such a basis of alleged sound correspondences no well-founded genetic affiliation can be derived. The probability that the sound pattern of two words will by chance fall in the range of such sound correspondences is by far too great. The geographic space from which words and names can be taken for these equations is also by far too wide: it encompasses the whole of the Balkans, Italy, and Anatolia. In this way there is no guarantee that the material under consideration will not be very heterogeneous in reality and comply only by pure chance with the lax requirements of sound correspondence as set by Budimir; the deficiencies of the etymological equations of the Kretschmer school are very markedly present. Thus the stimulating ingenuity of these Pre-Greek etymologies is counteracted by a lack of probabilistic foundation which cannot be disregarded.

Unfortunately the wealth of other Pre-Greek etymologies, all Indo-European and all connecting the Pre-Greek stratum with the ancient languages of the northern Balkans and with Albanian, that were presented in so many publications of Budimir all have the same properties.⁸⁴

Here are some examples:

ἄκιρος	'north wind':	Lat. <i>aquilo</i> 'north wind'
--------	---------------	---------------------------------

⁸⁴ Cf. in the first place BUDIMIR (1926–27, 1933, 1936, 1937a, 1948, 1950, 1951b, 1951–52, 1955, 1956a, 1957); for a more general outlook see BUDIMIR (1969).

Ἀχιλλεύς		The Homeric hero is thus explained as a personification of the north wind.
ξανθός, ξουθός	‘blond’:	Mod. E. <i>gold</i> ; OCS
σκάνδιξ	‘wild chervil’	<i>zlato</i> ‘gold’
σύας	‘dog’:	OI <i>śvā</i> ; Gr. κύων; Lat. <i>canis</i>
δαῦκον	‘Athamanta Cretensis’:	OCS <i>duxъ</i> ‘spirit’
δαύχνα	‘laurel’ (Thessalian)	SCr. <i>duha</i> ‘scent’
δαυχμός	‘Athamanta Cretensis’	Lit. <i>daūsos</i> pl. ‘air’
δάφνη	‘laurel’	IE <i>*dhousos</i>
λάφνη	‘laurel’	
Ἀπόλλων δαυχναφόρος	(Cyprus)	
Lat. <i>laurus</i>	‘laurel’	
δυναρεία	‘laurel’	

The alternation *d/l* and the monophthongization of *au* (from IE *ou*) to *a* are already known. But the equations presented here include a passage of intervocalic *-s-* to *-k/-kh-*. As a parallel that should make such a phonemic correspondence acceptable, Budimir presents a Syracusan gloss:

σαυκός	'dry':	OCS <i>suxъ</i> 'dry' from IE <i>*sousos</i> ; Lit. <i>saūsas</i> 'dry'
--------	--------	--

The velarization of intervocalic *-s-* in this position is parallel to the change that occurred under the same conditions in Slavic.

βύρσα	'hide':	SCr. <i>blazina</i> 'pillow'; Germ. <i>balg</i> 'hide'; IE <i>*bholg-</i>
σάρπη	'a sea fish':	Lat. <i>cornu</i> ; Mod.E. <i>horn</i> ; IE <i>*k'orn-</i>
σάλπη	'a sea fish'	
σάλπος	'a sea fish'	

σάλπιγξ	'clarion, horn'	
τύραννος	'ruler':	Goth. <i>þiudans</i> 'ruler'; IE <i>*teuta-</i> <i>nos</i>
Σειρήν	'lady'	
Etr. <i>Turan</i>	'Aphrodite'	

In the last example we have a change of an intervocalic dental stop into *r* as in Lat. *meridies* 'noon' which is derived from **medidies* 'midday'.

Budimir believes that there was a special closeness between the Indo-European languages of the Pre-Greek type and the Slavic languages. He specifies: (1) Both groups are non-centum, (2) in both occur metatheses of liquidae (cf. κίρκος/κρίκος), (3) in both -s- after an *u* changes into a velar consonant, and (4) both groups form preterital participles in -lo (cf. ὀπυόλαι γεγαμηκότες 'those who have married'). This, according to his opinion, can explain the rapid and almost complete slavization of the northern Balkan when Slavic-speaking groups appeared there. It also sheds new light on the direct cultural connections that exist between the folklore of Southern Slavs and the Ancient World.⁸⁵ He has therefore given special attention to etymological links between his pan-Balkan Pre-Greek and Slavic and has proposed a series of interesting equations.⁸⁶ Here are some of the more important examples:

<i>Daj-bog</i>	Slavic pagan deities:	Δωδώνη	IE <i>*dōi</i> 'shine'
<i>Daj-babe</i>		Δώς	mythological name
(<i>V</i>) <i>lada</i>	Slavic mythological name:	Φορθία	IE <i>*wold-</i>
		Λατώ	'rule' in diffe- rent alloglott- ic adaptations
SCr. <i>grad</i>	'town':	Γόρτυς	IE <i>*ghordh-</i>

⁸⁵ Cf. BUDIMIR (1950: 65-7; 1951b; 101).

⁸⁶ Cf. BUDIMIR (1956a, 1959b, 1960b).

Other etymological equations with Slavic words have already been mentioned above. All the reserves expressed there as to the probabilistic foundation of etymologies apply to these also.

Interesting is Budimir's teaching as to the ethnic name of his Pre-Greek Indo-European stratum that originally covered the whole of the Balkans, of Italy and Anatolia and remained dominant on the northern Balkans until the immigration of Slavic-speaking groups in the sixth and seventh century A.D. The Greeks knew Pelasgians in their literary tradition as the autochthonous population of their country. There is only one information dissenting as to the form of the name. The scholiast to Homer II. 16.233 has Πελαστικέ instead of Πελασγικέ. This is a *lectio difficilior* and has, as Budimir stresses, to be given full attention. If we connect it with Παλαιστή (a toponym in Epirus), the *deae Palaestinae* which belong there, with *Palaestinus* (the older name of the Strymon), with πενέσται (the name of the unfree population in ancient Thessaly), and with πελάσται/πελαῖσται (the term for the labouring population of Attica according to the lexicographers Ammonius and Pollex) it becomes highly probable that *Pelastai/Palastai/Palaistai* is the original form of the ethnic name that, as Budimir believes, denoted the speakers of Pre-Greek Indo-European wherever they spread.⁸⁷ The alternation *e/a* and *a/ai* before an *s* followed by a consonant is characteristic for the sound pattern of that language. The form Πελασγοί is a literary blending of *Pelastai* and πέλαγος 'the sea' or Πελαγῶνες, which in Budimir's opinion is another form of the same name.

Budimir teaches that the ethnic name *Pelastai* was also used in the northern Balkans. It can be recognized in the name of the Illyrian tribe *Pirustai* and perhaps in the toponym *Perast*. It appears also in 'Απενέσται, a toponym in Southern Italy. In the southeast, the speakers of Pelastic migrated as far as Palestine which by its very name *Palaestina* bears witness to them. In Hebrew sources the Indo-European immigrants from the Balkan are known as *P_hlištīm*, and Egyptian sources mention the invaders as *P-r-s-t*. The Biblical

⁸⁷ Hesychius informs us that the Athenians pronounced Πελαστικός instead of Πελασγικός.

Philistines are thus, according to Budimir, Indo-European intruders coming from the Aegean and the Balkan via Crete. The Philistine loan word in Hebrew *seren/srân* 'king of the Philistines' is accordingly Pelastic: another alloglottic adaptation of the original form of Greek *τύραννος* 'ruler'.⁸⁸

Budimir has brought into the discussion a lot of linguistic material. His ingenuity and vast erudition, his broad views and fascinating synthesis contributed much to a full review of Pre-Greek traces in the Greek vocabulary and the establishment of an Indo-European linguistic stratum older than that represented by our classical languages. It should be stressed, however, that although Budimir appears as a champion of pre-classical Indo-Europeanism he never denied the existence of a still older non-Indo-European linguistic stratum in the Aegean area and the whole Mediterranean.

It is only natural that Budimir's etymological work bears the stamp of the time when Kretschmer's school had introduced etymologizing without the probabilistic security that was implicitly required by the generally received and universally approved method of the neogrammarians. A student of mixoglotty and alloglottic adaptations with an exceptionally quick mind was, of course, prone to provide for a large variety of sound correspondences that could be admitted in an original etymological identity. This implies a dangerous trend toward the possibility of connecting sound chains arbitrarily if only their content is judged for some reason to correspond. It is sure that Budimir did not always manage to avoid this danger. Only few of his equations can seriously be taken for granted, and yet his work is a true mine of material and ideas. It must therefore always be taken into careful consideration when the complex of Pre-Greek and of the languages of the ancient Balkans is discussed and deserves the keen interest of every student of the subject.

⁸⁸ Cf. BUDIMIR (1937a).

2.3.6 *Pelasgian*

The doctrine about a Pre-Greek Indo-European stratum received further and very important reinforcement in the extensive work of Vladimir Georgiev, professor of linguistics at the University of Sofia. He too, like Brandenstein and Budimir, rejected Kretschmer's idea about a *Protindogermanisch* stratum on the Balkans and presented very interesting evidence for a purely Indo-European Pre-Greek linguistic stratum in the Aegean. At first he believed it to be Illyrian,⁸⁹ but later on he abandoned this view and came to the conclusion that Pre-Greek Indo-European, or *Pelasgian*, as he labeled it, was an independent member of the family, a new Indo-European language.⁹⁰

In Homeric Greek there are two almost synonymous words referring both to burial: *τάφος* 'funeral, grave' and *τύμβος* 'grave, tombstone'. Between them there is a vague similarity which suggests cognation, but in the frame of established sound correspondences they cannot be etymologically connected. The word *τάφος* is Greek and derived from IE **dhmbhos* by sound laws proper to Greek, and is thus cognate with Armenian *damban* 'grave', while *τύμβος* has nothing to do with this word family as long as we adhere to the sound laws established for the known Indo-European languages. But it could also be derived from IE **dhmbhos* if a new set of sound laws is postulated. In that case it would be the result of the following sound changes: *dh* > *d* by dissimilation of aspirates, and then *d* > *t*; further *m* > *um*, and *bh* > *b*.

This is of course quite hypothetical, something of a linguistic play, unless other words can be found which have no Greek etymology but can be explained from Indo-European by the application of the same set of sound laws. Georgiev has shown that there are such words. One is *πύργος* 'tower', evidently similar to German *burg* 'fortified castle' but not to be connected with it by Greek sound laws. The Germanic word goes back to IE **bhrghos* (cf. OI

⁸⁹ Cf. GEORGIEV (1936).

⁹⁰ Cf. GEORGIEV (1941-45, 1949, 1958a, 1958b, 1966a).

br̥hat, Avestan *bərəzant* 'high') or **bhr̥ghos* (cf. OCS *brěgъ* 'bank, hill'; Alb. *burg* 'mountain'). Both Indo-European variants would give Greek **πράχος* which does not exist. But if we assume sound laws analogous to the previous ones we have *bh > b* by dissimilation of aspirates, and then *b > p*; further *r > ur*, and *gh > g*.⁹¹ It seems thus as if both *τύμβος* and *πύργος* were borrowed by Greek from the same, otherwise unknown, Indo-European language.

Georgiev explains further words without Greek etymology in the same sense and thus gets a whole system of phonemic correspondences for his Pelasgian. The sound changes from Indo-European to Pelasgian can be summed up as follows:

- (1) *o* becomes *a*.
- (2) Syllabic sonants *r̥*, *l̥*, *n̥*, and *m̥* change to *ur* (*ru*), *ul* (*lu*), *un* (*on*), and *um* (*om*), or to *ir*, *il*, *in*, and *im*.
- (3) There is a shifting of the stops: *p t k* become *ph th kh*; *b d g* become *p t k*; *bh dh gh* become *b d g*.
- (4) The labio-velars are delabialized: *kʷ gʷ gʰ* become *kh k g*.
- (5) The palatals become sibilants or interdental spirants: *k'* becomes *s* (*ḥ*); *g'* and *g'h* become *z* (*ḍ*).
- (6) Antevocalic and intervocalic *s* is preserved.
- (7) There was a dissimilation of the aspirates, as in Greek and Indo-Iranian, before any other change occurred with the stops. Their shift applies to the dissimilated forms.

Georgiev points out that Pelasgian has by its sound laws a position intermediate between Albanian and Armenian, which corresponds with the geographical distribution of the respective areas.

⁹¹ It can be doubted whether an IE doublet **bhr̥gh-* can be assumed since OCS *brěgъ* can be a borrowing from a centum-language, and the etymology of Alb. *burg* is not above all doubts. Since the language introduced by Georgiev is satem (see below), the etymology of *πύργος* depends on whether a velar variant can be established besides the palatal one. For prosodic and semantic reasons Slavic scholars are inclined to accept *brěgъ* as inherited. This together with the Albanian cognate gives some weight to the explanation proposed by Georgiev.

For many obscure Greek vocabulary items Pelasgian etymologies can be proposed:

ἀλείφω	'anoint':	IE <i>*leip-</i> ; cf.: Gr. λίπος 'fat'; OI <i>limpati</i> 'anoint'
ἄμβων	'crest of a hill':	IE <i>*ombhō(n)</i> ; cf.: Gr. ὀμφα- λός 'navel'; Lat. <i>umbō</i> 'navel of the shield'
ἀσάμινθος	'bath tub':	IE <i>*ak'mento-</i> ; cf. OI <i>aśman-</i> <i>ta</i> 'fire place', <i>aśmā</i> 'stone'; Lit. <i>Ašmintā</i> 'na- me of a town'
ἄστυ	'town':	IE <i>*wostu</i> ; cf.: OI <i>vastu</i> 'abiding place'; OIr. <i>foss</i> 'permanence'
ἀτέμβω	'maltreat':	IE <i>*dhembh-</i> ; cf.: OI <i>da-</i> <i>bhati</i> 'maltreat, cheat', <i>dambhas</i> 'cheating'
βάσκανος	'sorcerer':	IE <i>*bhask-</i> ; cf.: Gr. φάσκειν 'speak', Lat. <i>fascinum</i> 'charm'
βάσκειν	'speak, injure'	
γαῖα	'earth':	IE <i>*ghəwyā</i> ; cf.: Gr. χάος 'chaos'; Goth. <i>gawi</i> 'land, region'; Arm. <i>gavar</i> 're- gion'
δεῦω	'wet, drench':	IE <i>*ghewō</i> ; cf.: Gr. χέω 'pour'
δύναμις	'force':	IE <i>*gu-</i> ; cf.: OI <i>junāti</i> 'stir'; Avest. <i>zavah-</i> 'force'
εἶω	'yield':	IE <i>*weig-</i> ; cf.: OI <i>vejate</i> 'go back'; German <i>weichen</i> 'give way'
ἐλαιον	'olive oil':	IE <i>*loiwom</i> ; cf.: OCS <i>lojъ</i> 'tallow'
θεράπνη	'dwelling':	IE <i>*terəbnā</i> ; cf.: Gr. τέρα- μνον 'dwelling'

ἔδη	'wood, forest':	IE * <i>widh-</i> ; cf.: OIr. <i>fid</i> 'wood, forest'; OHGerm. <i>witu</i> 'tree'
λαχὴ	'ditch':	IE * <i>lakwa</i> ; cf.: Gr. <i>λάκκος</i> 'ditch'; Lat. <i>lacus</i> 'lake'; OCS <i>loky</i> 'puddle'
ῥοφαζ	'unripe':	IE * <i>n-pok</i> 's' 'not cooked'; cf.: Gr. <i>πέπων</i> 'ripe'
πύνδαζ	'bottom of a jar':	IE * <i>bhu-n-dh-</i> ; cf.: Gr. <i>πυθμήν</i> 'bottom'; OI <i>budh-nam</i> 'fundament, base'
ῥόδον	'rose':	IE * <i>wrdhom</i> ; cf.: Arm. <i>vard</i> 'rose'
σέλας	'light':	IE * <i>swelos</i> ; cf.: OI <i>svarati</i> 'shine'
σιγή	'silence':	IE * <i>swigh-</i> ; cf.: Germ. <i>schweigen</i> 'be silent'
σῖτος	'grain':	IE * <i>kweid-</i> ; cf.: Goth. <i>hwai-teis</i> 'grain'
σῦς	'pig':	IE * <i>sūs</i> ; cf.: Gr. <i>ῥς</i> ; Lat. <i>sūs</i> 'pig'
ταχύς	'quick':	IE * <i>tokus</i> ; cf.: OI <i>takus</i> 'quick'
τέρμινθος, τέρβινθος, τερέβινθος, τερέμινθος, τρέμιθος		'Pistacia Terebinthus': IE * <i>derw-en-to-</i> ; cf.: ON <i>tjara</i> ; OE <i>teoru</i> , <i>tierwe</i> 'tar'; Lit. <i>derva</i> 'pine tree'
τύρσις	'tower':	IE * <i>dhṛgh-</i> ; cf.: OI <i>dhṛyati</i> 'fortify'
φελλεύς	'rocky', φελλόν 'rock':	IE * <i>pels-</i> ; cf.: Gr. <i>πέλλα</i> 'stone'; Germ. <i>fels</i> 'rock'
φιαρός	'fat':	IE * <i>pīwaros</i> ; cf.: Gr. <i>πιαρός</i> ; OI <i>pīvaras</i> 'fat'
φῦκος	'alg':	IE * <i>pūg-</i> ; cf.: Isl. <i>fūki</i> 'smell, putrid alg'

φύλαξ	'guard':	IE * <i>p_hl-ok</i> 's'; cf.: Gr. <i>πύλη</i> 'gate' and <i>ὄσσε</i> 'eyes', also Gr. <i>πυλωρός</i> , <i>θυρωρός</i> 'watcher of the gate'
-------	----------	---

This incomplete list shows that with the supposed set of phonemic correspondences some obscure Greek words can be provided with a more or less convincing Indo-European etymology. By going carefully through it one can see that the sound pattern does not always conform completely with the assumed system of correspondences (cf. *e* > *i*, *w* > *b/m* in **derwentos* > *τέρβινθος*, *τέρμινθος*; *gh* > *s* in *τύρσις*). These are of course details, such as have to be expected in cases of alloglottic adaptation and they cannot, at least in principle, impair the validity of the hypothesis. There is also local variation in Pelasgian that has to be taken into account. Still, since the number of etymologizable words is very small, such irregularities diminish considerably the probabilistic security of this etymological approach, the more so as the sound correspondences that are to be expected are themselves formulated laxly as far as the syllabic sonants are concerned.

But as problematic as many single Pelasgian etymologies proposed by Georgiev may be from the point of view of phonology, semantics, or the supposed Indo-European forms, he has discovered far too much regularity to discard it lightly as the result of pure chance and coincidence. Greek really seems to have borrowed from an unknown Indo-European language of the satem group and with a general shift of the stops as in Germanic and in Armenian.

After this has been stated, with all due reserve, one has to consider the fragility of Georgiev's construction. The main weakness of his method is that he chooses freely in the whole Greek vocabulary the words he wants to consider to be Pelasgian and explain as such. They are determined by no semantic or historic category. This gives the freedom to gather all chance coincidences, if such exist. The ingenuity and erudition of the author make it still less probable that such coincidences could escape his notice. All this has been well pointed out by Hester, the sharpest and best founded critic of the

Pelasgian hypotheses.⁹² It is his merit that he accepted the burden to combine an approach of extreme critical caution with a detailed treatment of the whole material adduced by Georgiev and other students of Pre-Greek Indo-European that followed his method.

Hester stressed another circumstance that weakens Georgiev's case. Most of his Pelasgian words show only one of the characteristic Pelasgian sound changes.⁹³ There are only a few words that attest the coherent coexistence of the Pelasgian sound changes in one language and their coincidence by chance is not to be excluded. Extreme caution in dealing with Pelasgian is therefore the only reasonable attitude. And yet, even Hester concedes:

it appears then that there is a small number of probable Indo-European loan-words in Greek.⁹⁴

Thus, in spite of a markedly critical attitude and many negative findings in a detailed analysis, the core of the thesis had to be accepted simply because, in order to discard it altogether, too much of coincidence had to be assumed. Taking into account the existing margin of insecurity we can all the same accept Georgiev's discovery of an Indo-European loan-word stratum in Greek. Every single etymology of his remains open to discussion and many of them appear problematic. However, the existence of the lexical stratum remains very probable.

Yet Georgiev goes much farther. He contends that the language to which this stratum in the Greek lexicon belongs is none other than the Pre-Greek language of the characteristic suffixes. Most of the Pre-Greek toponyms belong to it, and some Pelasgian words appear already in the Mycenaean Greek texts written in Linear B (cf. *watu* = *ῥάστυ*, and *su* = *σῦς*). Many objects belonging to the ancient Aegean culture are named by Pelasgian words (cf. *ἀσάμινθος*, *πύργος*, *τύρσις*). The speakers of Pelasgian are thus connected with the older type of Aegean life, even with the agrarian worship of a

⁹² Cf. HESTER (1965: 348).

⁹³ This was noted already by LEJEUNE (1947: 32).

⁹⁴ HESTER (1965: 384)

mother goddess which goes back to the Neolithic. The name of *Δημήτηρ* (Dor. *Δαμάττηρ*) testifies to this. That name is a compound with the meaning 'Earth the mother' and its first element is Pelasgian *da* from IE **(gh)dhā* 'earth'; cf. OI *kšā* 'earth'. The Greek equivalent would be **χθᾶ-*; cf. *χθών*.

Pelasgian as established by the Indo-European etymologies of non-Greek words is thus an autochthonous language of the Aegean area, intimately connected with the ancient toponymy of that region and with its oldest culture and worship.⁹⁵

Such a people, as the speakers of the newly discovered Pre-Greek language have been, can, according to Georgiev, very confidently be identified with the Pelasgians of ancient literature. The label *Pelasgian* for Georgiev's language, quite conventional in principle, can thus, in his opinion, be interpreted as a historical reality. He, too, believes that the form *Πελασγοί* is rather an artificial one and that the real name had the cluster *-st-* instead of *-sg-*. The scholion to Homer II. 16.233 with *Πελαστικέ* and the same pronunciation in Athens according to Hesychius make him assume *Πελαστοί* as the original form of the name. He explains the literary form as the result of a blending with *πέλαγος* 'sea', suggesting, by folk etymology, the vague connotation of a sea-faring people.

Georgiev, too, connects the Aegean Pelasts/Pelasgians with the biblical Philistines in Palestine, the Assyrian ethnonyms *Palašta/Pilištu*, and Egyptian *Pršt*. So we really are dealing with a 'people of the sea'. Thus, although his etymological basis is quite different, Georgiev shares many views on the broader historical frame with Budimir, though one does not find, in his writings, many references to the work of this scholar.⁹⁶

In order to be able to form a sound judgement on this expansion of Georgiev's thesis and in particular in order to decide whether the identification of his Pelasgian with the language of the Pre-Greek suffixes and the non-Greek toponymy is justified, it is necessary to illustrate his argumentation by at least some of his etymological

⁹⁵ Cf. GEORGIEV (1966a: 114–8).

⁹⁶ Cf. about the historical identification, the form of the name and its appearance in the Near East, GEORGIEV (1966a: 119).

interpretations of the material in question. To some extent is this a test on his hypothesis because here he is not free to choose the words he will etymologize. But on the other hand, the material here is mostly onomastic, and hence the semantic side of these etymologies must remain hypothetical. The trouble with such etymologies is, as Hester has correctly pointed out, that they are too easy to make.⁹⁷

Again we shall try to illustrate with an incomplete list of Georgiev's etymologies the proof he gives for his contention about Pelasgian as the Aegean substratum language:

Βρένθη:	IE <i>*bhrentā</i> ; cf.: Messap. <i>βρενδον</i> <i>ἐλαφον</i> Hes.; Swed. <i>brind</i> 'deer'
Ἐρύμανθος:	Myc. <i>orumato</i> = Ὀρύμανθος IE <i>*(e)urumontos</i> ; cf.: Gr. εὐρύς 'broad'; OI <i>uru</i> 'broad' and Lat. <i>mons</i> , gen. <i>montis</i> 'mountain'. Ἐρυ- from εὐρυ-. Ὀρυ- by dissimilation from <i>uru</i> .
Κύνθος:	IE <i>*k₁Hto-</i> cf.: OI <i>kuṭam</i> 'peak', with an individual sound change λθ > νθ
Βερέκυνθος:	IE <i>*bhere-k₁Hto-</i> 'peak bearer'
Ἀράκυνθος:	cf.: ἄρακος 'vulture' i.e. 'peak of vultures'
Ζάκυνθος:	cf.: ζα- < δια- 'very' i.e. 'with many peaks'
Ῥήσκονθος:	IE <i>*rēg-k₁Hto-</i> 'king's peak'
Κόρινθος:	IE <i>*g₂riwentos</i> 'mountainous'; cf.: OI <i>giri</i> 'mountain'; Alb. <i>gur</i> 'stone'; Hitt. <i>Kuriwanda</i> , the name of a mountain
Λαβύρινθος:	IE <i>*lawrwentos</i> 'stony'; cf.: Gr. λαῖψας; Luw. <i>lawar-</i> 'stone'
Πύρανθος:	IE <i>*(s)pūrowentos</i> 'grainy'; cf.: Gr. (σ)πῦρός 'grain'; Hitt. <i>Puranda</i> , the name of a town
Λάρισα:	IE <i>*lawarwentya</i> 'stony'
Ἀχελῷος:	name of rivers: IE <i>*ak^w</i> ; cf.: Lat. <i>aqua</i> 'water'
Θῆβαι:	IE <i>*(s)tēbhā</i> 'stone'; cf.: Pruss. <i>stobis</i> 'stone'

⁹⁷ Cf. GEORGIEV (1966a: 277)

According to Georgiev, most of the place names with suffixes containing -ss-/-tt- are Greek.

If one compares these etymologies with those of the vocabulary words, a difference appears immediately. First of all, in the case of place names of an unknown language, the meanings can be only guesses. No parallels and observable topographical features can really help because we cannot know whether in the given case the denomination follows the same semantic pattern as in the assumed parallel and whether it in fact describes topography. Apart from this being so, it is even more crucial that in so many cases individual sound changes and anomalous developments have to be assumed in order to explain the phonemic pattern of these names. In the etymology of Κύνθος an irregular change of *l* > *n* is assumed in order to connect this word with OI *kuṭam* 'peak' whose etymology is very doubtful. The proposed one involves Fortunatov's law which has never been universally accepted by comparative philologists. Such an explanation of the Pre-Greek mountain name fails to convince because it is deprived of almost all the probabilistic safeguards of a good etymology.

The explanation of Ἐρύμανθος is of considerable importance as the string of sounds is long and thus in itself gives more information. The probability of coincidence by pure chance decreases with the number of syllables in a sequence. The proposed semantics are plausible although nobody can know whether the name really meant 'broad mountain'. Yet the sound pattern requires in both variant forms of the name the *ad hoc* assumption of individual and irregular sound change. Furthermore, the derivational pattern of the Indo-European prototype **-montos* remains isolated. This is the trouble also with the rest of the etymologized names in -nth-. Parallels are proposed only for the root, but seldom for its derivations, and it is difficult to see why a feminine in -went- should appear in Greek as a substantive of the *o*-declension instead of the type in -εσσα, so well known also in toponymy (cf. Δελοφῶσσα and Ὑδροῦσσα). Therefore, leaving the discussion of every single etymology of Pre-Greek place names to the scholars interested in this special field, we cannot avoid the conclusion that Georgiev's second contention

has not yet been proved. There are no etymologies valid enough to show that Pelasgian, the language of the words which were borrowed in Greek from another Indo-European language unknown from other sources, is identical with the language to which the characteristic Pre-Greek place names originally belong.

This being so, the identification of the language of the Indo-European borrowings with the language of the historical Pelasgians becomes quite untenable, even more so when we know how little the literary tradition about the Pelasgians as the autochthonous population of the whole of Greece can be trusted. Whatever we may think of the original form of the name of this ethnic group and of its connections with Palestine and the Philistines, no closer relation between this complex and the established stratum of loan words in Greek from another otherwise unknown Indo-European language can be assumed with confidence.

It remains thus to await clarification, if it can be attained, from further work in the field. In spite of a prevalent agnostic or even negative attitude among Georgiev's reviewers,⁹⁸ there were scholars who not only accepted his results in their entirety, but began to work actively on his lines. So we have today something like a school of Pelasgian linguistics, centered in Austria and in Belgium.

W. Merlingen from Vienna accepts Georgiev's method and the main bulk of his etymologies, though slightly amending his sound laws and proposing new etymologies. He differs essentially only in historical interpretation. He does not believe that so many important words with so diverse meanings can be borrowed from a substratum. He therefore thinks that the language called *Pelasgian* by Georgiev belonged to a people which ruled the Greeks for a time and led them to the Trojan war. Besides the numerous loan words, this ruling people left to the Greeks their name. They were called *Achaeans* and their name was transferred to their Greek subjects just as that of the German Franks and Turkish Bulgars remained to designate their former Romance and Slavic subjects. Merlingen therefore calls the language of the sound shifting Indo-European

⁹⁸ Cf. HESTER (1965: 347-8), GEORGIEV (1966a: 115).

loan words *Akhaean* in order to distinguish it from Greek *Achaeans*. This people were the *Ahhijawa* of the Hittite, and the *Aqaiwaša* of the Egyptian sources. After a period of domination over the Greeks, the Akhaeans disappeared from the historic scene.⁹⁹

Another innovation of Merlingen's is that he believes to have discovered in the Greek vocabulary loans from another unknown Indo-European language. Having no historical name for it, he calls it *Psi-Greek* after an outstanding feature of its supposed sound development: IE *p t k k'* changed in this language to *ps s ks ks'*, while *b d g g'* appear as *ph th kh kh'*, and *bh dh gh gh'* as *b d g g'*. There is consequently in this language also a consonant shift but one different from that found in Pelasgian (or *Akhaean*, as Merlingen calls it). Before the consonant shift took place the aspirates were dissimilated in voicing as well as in aspiration. Psi-Greek is a centum-language reflecting palatals and pure velars as velars. The labio-velars appear as labials: *k^w g^w g^wh* become *ph bh b*. The vowels show substantial changes too: *o* and *e* become *u* and *i*, respectively (except before sonants), *ā* becomes *ō*, and *ē* becomes *ā*; the changes of the syllabic sonants are very irregular and variable. Assuming these and other sound changes for his Psi-Greek, Merlingen proposes quite simple etymologies for a considerable number of Greek words. Thus: θεός 'god' becomes a Psi-Greek cognate of Lat. *deus* 'god'; ξανθός 'blond' a cognate of Lat. *candidus* 'white'; and ἄνθρωπος 'man' a cognate of Gr. ἀνὴρ, gen. ἀνδρός 'man'.

Merlingen has indeed found new ways to etymologize Greek words with obscure affiliations. Here we can give only some examples:

- μύξα 'discharge from the nose' to Lat. *mucus* 'mucus'
- ὀξύς 'sharp' to Gr. ἄκρος 'topmost', Lat. *acus* 'needle'
- σάος 'healthy' to Gr. τὰς 'big'
- ψύλλος 'flea' to Lat. *pulex* 'flea'
- ψυχή 'soul' to OCS *puxati* 'blow'

⁹⁹ Cf. MERLINGEN (1955, 1962).

μάχη 'battle' to Lat. *macto* 'slaughter'

μῆχος 'means' to Goth. *mag* 'can'

ψεύδω 'cheat by lies' to Gr. πρύθω 'give notice' (IE *bheudh-*)

ὄργια 'secret worship' to Gr. ὀρχέομαι 'dance'¹⁰⁰

Psi-Greek is, as Merlingen sees it, also a superstratum, older than the Akhaean one and probably dating back to before 2000 B.C. Its center probably is Crete, its area very wide. It strongly influenced "Akhaean", and many of its words borrowed by the Greeks from the Akhaeans who played the role of linguistic mediators in the Aegean area. In many Psi-Greek words in the Greek vocabulary, traces of Akhaean (Pelagian) sound changes can be detected. Psi-Greek thus apparently was a superstratum to Akhaean (Pelagian) and its speakers for a time ruled somewhere over the speakers of that language. In toponymy, Psi-Greek left a noticeable trace in the place names with the characteristic formative element *-ss-*, while those in *-nth-* are mostly Akhaean (Pelagian). The names with *-ss-* show phonological evidence of direct transmission from Psi-Greek to Greek.¹⁰¹

Merlingen's results are, no doubt, both interesting and stimulating. He has explored new avenues of etymologizing, detected many hidden possibilities, and pointed out a set of hitherto unnoticed regularities. But the question remains of the validity of these etymologies, of their probabilistic foundation. The recurrence of Psi-Greek sound correspondences is, no doubt, noteworthy and deserves further attention. There is also no reason why Greek should not have borrowed words from two or more lost Indo-European languages. There is therefore nothing to say against Merlingen's supposing a new Indo-European language in the ancient Aegean world. And yet, with Greek, Akhaean (Pelagian), and Psi-Greek sound laws at his disposal, Merlingen is in an all too favorable position when searching for Indo-European etymologies of Greek words. Establishing equations is in such circumstances by far too easy to have

¹⁰⁰ Cf. MERLINGEN (1953-54, 1963).

¹⁰¹ Cf. MERLINGEN (1962: 38-48, *et passim*), HESTER (1968: 231-2).

satisfactory explanatory power, the more so as Merlingen reckons with many irregularities, individual adaptations, and different but coexisting stages of sound change, both in Akhaean and in Psi-Greek. In the older stages the consonant shift remains incomplete, thus neither the Akhaean (Pelagian) nor the Psi-Greek sound laws are really obligatory for etymologies operating with these languages.

The general conclusion is that the introduction of Psi-Greek, in spite of its general historical plausibility and in spite of a certain regularity which in etymologic equations sometimes appears of a perplexing simplicity, at this moment when the probabilistic foundations of Pre-Greek linguistics have to be seriously checked and the sound core of the proposed hypotheses eventually established, confuses rather than elucidates the whole picture. From Merlingen's efforts we learn perhaps more about the insufficiency of our etymological method than about the genetic affiliations of the Greek vocabulary. In principle, one language must be firmly established before suppositions about others can be introduced.¹⁰²

Important and useful is Merlingen's idea that loan words do not necessarily belong to a substratum but may also be introduced from a superstratum or an adstratum. This should caution us to jump to conclusions about the Pre-Greek linguistic situation from loan words more or less firmly established in the Greek vocabulary.

Another student of traces of unknown Indo-European languages in the Greek vocabulary is O. Haas, also from Vienna. He has summed up the whole question in a very handy way and discussed some of the major difficulties.¹⁰³ He accepts the fundamental tenets of Georgiev, but refuses to call his language *Pelagian*. He gives the linguistic data no historical interpretation and prefers to designate the hypothetical language as *Pre-Greek* while stating explicitly that no chronological priority is implied. He also believes that a significant diversity can be recognized in the Pre-Greek material and he is by no means dogmatic as to its unity. He believes to have established a further Pre-Greek sound law: the passage of labials and velars

¹⁰² Cf. HESTER (1965: 347-8; 1967; 1968: 233-4).

¹⁰³ Cf. HAAS (1959a).

to *ps* and *ks* before *u* and diphthongs containing *u*. In some cases *s* has become *h* after *i*, *u*, and *r* (as in Slavic). Here are some examples:

ψυχή	'soul', PGr. <i>phjühā</i> :	IE * <i>pūsā</i> cf. Czech <i>psychati</i> 'blow'
ψύλλα	'flea', PGr. <i>phjulja</i> :	IE * <i>pūl-</i> cf. Lat. <i>pulex</i> 'flea'
ψαυκρός	'quick', PGr. <i>bjaukro-</i> :	IE * <i>bhougro-</i> cf. Lit. <i>baugūs</i> 'timid'
πίττακος	'parrot', PGr. <i>phjutakho-</i> :	IE * <i>putako-</i> cf. Czech <i>ptak</i> 'bird'
ὀξύς	'sharp', PGr. <i>akhjus</i> :	IE * <i>akus</i> cf. Gr. ὄξος 'topmost'
ξύω	'scratch, scrape', PGr. <i>khjūjō</i> :	IE * <i>kūyō</i> cf. Russ. <i>kuju</i> 'I forge'

It is apparent that this sound law is based on the same observations that led Merlingen to the assumption of his Psi-Greek. Haas believes that the reserved agnosticism of many reviewers of works on Pre-Greek etymology is hypercritical and amounts to a refusal to follow very substantial leads offered by the material. But he is also quite aware of the difficulties and the lack of ultimate proof.¹⁰⁴ He stresses further the possibility to establish a significant number of etymological equations between supposedly Pre-Greek words and the vocabulary of Slavic languages.¹⁰⁵

Another scholar who accepts the fundamental core of Georgiev's hypothesis is the Belgian A. J. Van Windekens. He calls the Pre-Greek Indo-European language *Pelasgian*, but regards this name only as a conventional label. He is not inclined to give the linguistic data he establishes any historical interpretation except the very general one that he tries to find loans from a Pre-Greek substratum in the Greek vocabulary.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. HAAS (1955, 1959a, 1959b).

¹⁰⁵ Cf. HAAS (1961a).

In the main, he accepts the sound laws established by Georgiev with but slight changes. He is less concerned with ordinary Greek vocabulary words and concentrates on "Aegean" words and place names that were already identified as probable loans. Therefore he has paid much attention to Pelasgian word formation. The peculiar shape of the Pre-Greek words and place names made it necessary for him to assume that, as compared with other Indo-European languages, Pelasgian introduced particularly many innovations in its patterns of derivation and suffixation. Long compound suffixes have replaced the older simple ones. Thus the suffixes containing the characteristic cluster *-nth-* are but Indo-European themes in *-n* enlarged by a *-t*. This derivational pattern can be observed in other Indo-European languages, too, but in Pelasgian it had a much wider distribution and a higher frequency. Cf. τέρβινθος: IE **deru-en-t-os*; ἀσάμινθος: IE **ak-om-en-t-os*; Πέργαμος: IE **bhergh-am-os*; ἐρέβινθος: IE **erew-en-t-os* etc.

Such derivational innovations on a larger scale are quite possible in an Indo-European language. It is only bad when they have to be assumed for a hypothetical language that has been introduced in the first place in order to make Indo-European etymologies possible for a set of obscure terms and geographical names. Although he accepts in general the Pelasgian sound laws as posited by Georgiev, Van Windekens accepts only part of his etymologies and regards these at least as well-founded. In addition, he has proposed a considerable number of his own. In many details he comes to the same conclusions as Georgiev and the other Pelasgianists, but he has explored many new avenues and shown many new possibilities of etymological explanation. He did not, of course, succeed in giving his equations a firmer probabilistic basis than that of the other current Pelasgian etymologies.¹⁰⁶

A scholar very productive in Pelasgian etymologies is the Belgian A. Carnoy. Most of his equations are based on the assumption of short roots with a very general meaning. They are mostly mere guesses with a probabilistic basis much weaker than that of the

¹⁰⁶ Cf. VAN WINDEKENS (1952, 1954, 1958, 1959, 1960.)

average Pelasgian etymologies of other authors.¹⁰⁷ Carnoy is inclined to believe that the sheer number of etymologies makes the theory certain. This is a grave misunderstanding of the very nature of etymological equations.

Although represented by scholars with marked individual traits and essentially independent in their work, the Pelasgian theory can and must be regarded as a whole.¹⁰⁸ D. Hester has given an important contribution to it by a critical review of the whole complex.¹⁰⁹ With much care and objectivity he has examined the etymologies and the weight of their evidence and found it too light. The only point he accepts as proven by the Pelasgianists is that Greek has probably borrowed some words from an otherwise unknown Indo-European language. But it is easier for him to assume that these loans come from a neighbouring language than from a Pre-Greek substratum. He sees no valid reason to connect them with the ancient Aegean.

One cannot but accept the soundness of Hester's reasoning. It was really beneficial that a person with an extremely cautious and critical attitude towards Pelasgian undertook the laborious task to examine the whole evidence in detail. So he was able to show that Pelasgian etymology has not succeeded to comply with the requirements of sound etymological research and that its more or less explicitly announced claim to have proved the Indo-European character of the Aegean substratum has no firm basis. The Pelasgian theory had aroused far too much pro and contra attitudes.¹¹⁰ It had to be shown by accepting the premises of Pelasgianist research that it has not yet provided us with the proofs required to make it accepted as a more or less indisputable fact. Only a criticism based on a full knowledge of the evidence could have a constructive effect.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. CARNOY (1955, 1959).

¹⁰⁸ The first bibliographical summary is given by GINDIN (1959); cf. the presentation by HARMATTA (1964).

¹⁰⁹ Cf. HESTER (1965, 1968). Polemic answers by GEORGIEV (1966c) and MERLINGEN (1967). Cf. again HESTER (1966, 1967).

¹¹⁰ Cf. HESTER (1965: 347-8; 1968: 228-9). On questions of principle cf. MATVEEV (1965).

Hence, it would be a mistake to view Hester's criticism as a reason to reject the work of the Pelasgianists. From them we have learned much about Greek vocabulary and about the nature of etymological research. We cannot accept the teaching of any Pelasgianist as a valid and final solution of the Pre-Greek problem. But this does not mean that their results have not changed our picture of it. We are now much more aware of both the possibilities of Indo-European etymologizing in that field and of its limitations.

The unity of Pre-Greek has become very questionable. It will be difficult in the future to assume lightheartedly that it was either massively Indo-European or massively non-Indo-European. The etymological avenues explored in this connection must be taken into consideration by future workers in the field. The best equations should not be ignored even by the writers of etymological dictionaries. An etymological equation, as we know all too well, has not to be absolutely certain in order to be noteworthy and interesting.

2.3.7 *Anatolian*

In most recent times an old doctrine has received new life. It is the doctrine about the connections of the Pre-Greek substratum with Asia Minor. Kretschmer believed the substratum to be more or less a mere extension of the non-Indo-European linguistic area of Asia Minor. Our knowledge is very much richer today. The discovery of the Indo-European languages of ancient Anatolia (Hittite, Luwian, and Palaian) has changed the whole picture essentially. A new Anatolian group of Indo-European languages has been established, and it could be proven, or at least made probable, that such classical Micrasiatic languages as Lycian, Lydian, and Carian also belong to it. It is very natural that some scholars attempted a reinterpretation of the old evidence of linguistic links between the Pre-Greek Aegean and Asia Minor in terms of Anatolian Indo-European.

The first one to make a decisive step in that direction was L. Palmer. He assumes that Crete and the whole of Greece were in Pre-Greek times settled by Luwians. According to him, the Pre-Greek substratum was Luwian. His conclusions are based on

combined linguistic and archaeological evidence. The linguistic data he operates with are rather tenuous. His chief argument is a tentative reading of Minoan documents written in Linear A. On more than one of these inscriptions many scholars have read the word (j)*a-sa-ra(-me)*, presumably a religious term. He equates that with Hitt. *išḫaššaraš* 'lady' and *išḫaššaraš-miš* 'my lady', and he supposes that the word from the Minoan inscription has the same meaning and refers to the Aegean Mother Goddess. Since Luwian initial *a-* corresponds to initial *i-* in Hittite (cf. Hitt. *Ištanuwa*: Luw. *Aštanuwa*), Palmer concludes that the Minoan religious term is Luwian *asharas(-mes)* '(my) Lady'.

As further evidence he adduces some tentative readings of words with a final *-ti* on Linear A inscriptions. He interprets them as Luwian verb forms (3 person singular present). He explains also the Cretan epiclesis of the goddess Artemis: Δικτόννα as derived from Luw. *Diktuwanna* with the Luwian suffix *-wana* by which many ethnicons are formed. The meaning of this epiclesis is according to him 'Lady of mount Dicte'. Luwian is in Palmer's view also Παρνασσός, a well-known oronym in Phocis (Greece) and in Cappadocia (Asia Minor). This other mountain lies in the ancient Luwian area. Palmer explains the name as Luwian *Parnašša*, a derivation of Luwian *parna-* 'house, temple' by the possessive suffix *-ašša-* 'place of the temple'. On the slopes of mount Parnassos lies in fact the famous temple of Apollo in Delphi.

All this is, of course, not enough to prove the fact that there existed a Luwian substrate in the whole Aegean area and that the inscriptions in Linear A were written in that language. Thus the main burden of Palmer's thesis falls on archaeological evidence. He follows the bold hypothesis of J. Mellaart, an archaeologist who interpreted the traces of material culture as testifying to a great Luwian migration about 2500 B.C. from the North-Eastern Balkans to the Aegean area and Anatolia. This interpretation of archaeological findings is neither based on an adequate evidence nor is it generally accepted among specialists.¹¹¹ Palmer's identifi-

¹¹¹ Cf. SCHACHERMEYER (1962).

cation of Pre-Greek with Luwian remains thus a daring step in an unknown direction without the necessary evidence which could it make a really serious contribution.¹¹² And yet, his bold imagination has introduced a new point of view into the debate, one that may seem fruitful and therefore has made him find followers. One of them is J. Huxley. He has broadened the linguistic basis of the argument by trying to support his conclusions with Luwian etymologies of many Pre-Greek toponyms. In doing so he has indicated some really noteworthy possibilities.¹¹³

Another attempt to identify the Pre-Greek substratum as Anatolian was made by A. Heubeck. As far as the interpretation of archaeological evidence goes, his argumentation proceeds in the frame sketched by Mellaart and Palmer.¹¹⁴ He introduces only a terminological innovation. While Palmer calls the speakers of the Anatolian substrate *Luwians*, Heubeck prefers the term *Hittites* although this does not imply a linguistic identity with the language of the Hittite documents, but only a not quite strictly defined relationship, the closest cognates of Pre-Greek Anatolian being Lycian and Lydian. These speakers of Anatolian entered the Aegean area in two major migrations: one to Greece at the beginning of the second millennium, and another to Crete at the end of the eighteenth century B.C. This Anatolian stratum there superseded an older non-Indo-European one. Heubeck calls it *Lelegian*. He believes thus that Pre-Greek Indo-European was Anatolian and therefore rejects its assignment to the satem group as well as the shift of the stops, the main features of "Pelagian" Pre-Greek.

The linguistic evidence introduced into the discussion by Heubeck is new and interesting. He adduces the newly discovered Mycenaean sources and even the Cretan inscriptions in Linear A. He believes that these texts are written in the Anatolian Minoan language and that the script is adapted to its peculiar phonological system. The Aegean linear scripts (A and B) thus mirror the properties of Pre-Greek Anatolian phonology. Especially significant

¹¹² Cf. PALMER (1958a, 1958b, 1962).

¹¹³ Cf. HUXLEY (1961).

¹¹⁴ Cf. HEUBECK (1961: 20).

is the lack of any distinction between voiceless, voiced, and aspirated stops. It seems, therefore, that Pre-Greek Indo-European ignored these phonological oppositions. The Pre-Greek names appear to confirm this because they often show alternations of voiceless, voiced, and aspirated stops. In this respect Pre-Greek is really similar to Anatolian: in Hittite, Luwian, and Palaian the modes of articulation of the stops are totally neglected in the script, while Lydian and Lycian show great inconsistency.

The alternation of *d* and *l* is another feature that in Heubeck's view links Pre-Greek with Anatolian, (cf. *Λαβύρινθος*: Myc. *dapuritojo*; *καλάμινθα* 'catmint, mint': Myc. *kadamita*; *Ὀδυσσεύς*, *Ὀλυττεύς*, *Ὀλύξης*). Heubeck believes that this alternation is a Greek rendering of a specific Anatolian sound. The Pre-Greek change of sonantic *r* to *ur* (as supposed also by Georgiev) can be compared with Lyd. *ástrkoš*: *ásturkoš* and others.

Very interesting is Heubeck's attempt to adduce material from Mycenaean inscriptions. He has gathered personal names that do not allow a Greek interpretation. Such names are more numerous in Knossos than in Pylos, and among them are many forms in *-u*, *-i*, *-e*, and *-o*. These morphological types of names are characteristic not only for the Pre-Greek and Micrasiatic onomastic material, but they can also be recognized in the Cretan inscriptions in Linear A as far as we can read them by identifying some graphemes with those of Linear B.

Heubeck has introduced many fresh ideas and a lot of new material into the discussion of Pre-Greek. While dealing with Pre-Greek, it is also necessary to begin to take seriously and extensively into consideration the Mycenaean and Minoan documents. The Anatolian connections of Pre-Greek should also not be lost from view. For all these reasons, Heubeck has acquired a lasting merit with his book. It gave Pre-Greek studies a new direction and opened new perspectives. However, the evidence he adduces gives us no certainty and remains disputable. Heubeck's work can by no means be accepted as conclusive.¹¹⁵

¹¹⁵ Cf. HEUBECK (1961), KATIČIĆ (1964d).

A very important further step in the same direction was made by L. A. Gindin. He has given a quite comprehensive presentation of the whole Pre-Greek complex trying to harmonize the various views by introducing a variety of Pre-Greek linguistic strata.¹¹⁶ He stresses the importance of the radical elements in Pre-Greek toponymy since suffix analysis alone can give no certain results. Most of the characteristic suffixes recur in many languages, Indo-European and non-Indo-European.¹¹⁷ He therefore examines thoroughly the lexical morphemes of Pre-Greek names and arrives at interesting and unexpected conclusions.

Some names are according to him "Aegean". Their distribution is wide, their occurrence frequent, and their stems cannot be connected with Anatolian linguistic material. Such names are: *Λάρισα*, *Κάρνος*, *Σάμος*, *Θήβαι*, and their cognates. The names *Τιτάριον* (mountains in Thessaly), *Τίτυρος* (a town on Crete), *Τιτώ* (the Dawn), and *Τιτάν* etc. are also explained as "Aegean", but they belong to the Indo-European lexicon and are corradical with the words derived in various languages from IE **dyeu-* and **din-* meaning 'heaven' and 'day', respectively. Gindin thus accepts Kretschmer's *Protindogermanisch* etymologies, including that of *Τινδαρίδαι*, but qualifies them as Indo-European and belonging to an unknown substratum language. Toponyms like *Ἄρνη*, (a spring in Arcadia and towns in Boeotia, Thessaly, and Thrace), *Ἄρνησσα* (a town in Macedonia), *Ἄρνεαί* (a town in Lycia), *Κάβαρνης* (older name of the island Paros), *Ἀτάρνη* (town in Mysia), etc. belong, according to Gindin, also to the "Aegean" stratum but have intimate links with the Old-European hydronymy: cf. *Arna* (rivers in Gaulle, a town in Umbria), *Arona*, *Aruona* (rivers in Latvia). This element *Arn-* Gindin is also inclined to regard as Indo-European.¹¹⁸

Other Pre-Greek place names have special connections with Anatolian languages and especially with Anatolian toponymy. Such are:

¹¹⁶ Cf. GINDIN (1967).

¹¹⁷ Cf. GINDIN (1967: 80-1).

¹¹⁸ Cf. GINDIN (1967: 80-94); for the notion of Old-European hydronymy, cf. KRAHE (1954, 1963) and SCHMID (1968).

Λυκαονία	(older name of Arcadia, name of an Anatolian Province)	Hitt. <i>Lukkā</i> (name of a part of Anatolia)
Λυκόα	(town in Arcadia)	
Λύκτος	(town on Crete)	
Καρία	(province in western Anatolia, the acropolis of Megara)	<i>Karḫuḫa</i> (a deity of Karkemish)
Κάρ	(a Carian, the founder of the Acropolis of Megara)	<i>Karzi</i> (Anatolian deity)
Καρίς	(old name of Cos)	
Καρίδες	(a town in Phrygia)	
Καριστορηγός	(an epitheton of Zeus)	
Κάρυστος	(town in Euboea)	
etc.		
Μαυσός	(a village near Corinth)	Phryg. Γδαμ-μανα 'Mother Earth' (a toponym) Lyc. <i>Meri-mawa</i> (name of a woman)
Καῦνος	(town on Crete)	Hitt. <i>Kawija</i> (personal name) Lyd. <i>kave</i> 'priest'
Ἰόνες	'Ionians'	Hitt. <i>Ijaja</i> (name of a goddess)
Ἄργος Ἰασον	(town in Achaea)	Phryg. Ἰα (name of a goddess)
Μάσης	(a town in Argolis, a locality in Boeotia, a lake, an island and a helmet in Argolis)	Luw. <i>maššani</i> - 'god' Lyc. <i>mahana</i> 'god' (dat. plur.) Μάνσης (a Lydian hero)

Ταῦγετον	(mountain in Laconia)	Lyd. <i>tavša</i> - 'big, mighty'
Ἀρίσβη	(towns in Boeotia, on Lesbos, in Troas, name of mythological persons)	Hitt. <i>Ara</i> - (name of a god) Lyc. <i>esbe</i> - 'horse'; cf. Gr. Ποσειδίππη
Παρνασσός	(mountain in Greece, town in Cappadocia)	Hitt. <i>Parnašša</i> - 'name of a town' Hitt. <i>parn</i> - 'house' Luw. <i>parna</i> - 'house' Lyc. <i>prñezi</i> - 'οἰκεῖος' Luw. <i>parnašša</i> - 'belonging to the (divine) house' ¹¹⁹
Ἰσταλία	(a sacred spring in Delphi, a town in Cilicia)	Hitt. <i>Haštali</i> - (personal name) Hitt. <i>haštaliatar</i> 'bravery' Hitt. <i>haštali</i> - 'hero'
Πύρανθος	(a town on Crete)	Hitt. <i>Puranda</i> - (a town in Arzawa)
Πύρασος	(a town in Thessaly)	
Πήδασος	(a town in Messenia, towns in Caria and Troas)	Hitt. <i>Petaša</i> - (a town in central Anatolia) Hitt. <i>peda</i> - 'place'
Πέργαμον	(a town on Crete and one in Troas)	Hitt. <i>parku</i> - 'high' Urart. <i>burgana</i> 'palace'
πύργος	'tower'	
πέργαμα	'fortifications'	
etc.		

¹¹⁹ This interpretation is supported by the fact that in *Parnašša* there was the sanctuary of a Hurrian deity and on the slopes of mount Parnassus there was the temple of Delphi.

Γόρτυς	(a town on Crete and one in Arcadia)	Hitt. <i>gurta</i> - 'fortress'
λαβύρινθος	(a mythical building on Crete)	Lyd. λάβρυς 'double axe'

On the basis of such etymological interpretations, Gindin concludes that in Pre-Greek toponymy traces of an Anatolian substratum have been preserved. He does not subscribe to the teaching about the unity of Pre-Greek, but assumes that there has been more than one linguistic stratum. The oldest one was not Indo-European. Gindin calls it *Aegean* and thinks that even in this first linguistic setting there were some onomastic elements borrowed from Indo-European sources. The first Indo-European stratum in the Aegean area was Anatolian, and of all Pre-Greek strata this one can be most firmly established with the help of the languages of the ancient Anatolian texts. Another Indo-European layer is that of Georgiev although the evidence for it is far more ambiguous. The third Indo-European stratum is then, according to Gindin, the Greek one.

A close linguistic contact can be observed between Georgiev's Pre-Greek and the Anatolian layer. Cf., e.g., Luw. Hier. *tuwarsa-pied ou pampre de vigne* which is borrowed into Greek as θύρσος 'wand wreathed in ivy and vine-leaves with a pine cone on the top' with the characteristic Pelasgian change of *t* to *th*. Another Anatolian loan by mediation of Pelasgian is φῦρκος 'wall', while πύργος is the result of direct borrowing.

The Anatolian equations proposed by Gindin are, no doubt, very interesting. He has explored avenues totally unknown till now and has thus considerably enriched the material of Pre-Greek studies. His etymologies, to be sure, are no more than attempts, since in that field verification is extremely difficult. The meanings of Pre-Greek place names being only hypothetical, even the most plausible etymological equations remain risky. And yet, the wealth of possible and easy Anatolian connections in Pre-Greek onomastics cannot be lightly pushed aside. Gindin has definitely succeeded in making his Anatolian stratum very probable although every

single equation of his may remain problematic and require further discussion.

2.3.8 Preserved texts

The Minoan inscription written in Linear A and in the Hieroglyphic script of Crete are probably the most important texts of a Pre-Greek Aegean language presently at our disposal. Thus far, no convincing decipherment has been proposed for them and we can use them only to a very limited extent.

These texts were edited by Evans, Caratelli, and Charpouthier.¹²⁰ No attempt at their decipherment has as yet been successful. They can be read partly because some of the signs occur in Linear B also and have there presumably the same sound values as in Linear A. The language itself so far resisted all interpretations. Gordon supposed that it was Semitic and interpreted the texts on that basis.¹²¹ Palmer suggested Luwian as the language of the inscriptions in Linear A but did not engage in attempts at a detailed interpretation.¹²² Heubeck in principle supports Palmer's views.¹²³ Georgiev believed that he could read the inscriptions in Linear A as Greek. Afterwards he began to distinguish Greek and Eteocretan (Pre-Greek) inscriptions among those written in Linear A. Eteocretan he believes to be an Anatolian (Hittite-Luwian) language.¹²⁴ All these interpretations for the time being remain quite hypothetical.

Non-Greek inscriptions in Greek characters were found in Praesos and Dreros on Crete.¹²⁵ They too, remain undeciphered till now. They are written *in continuo* and present great difficulties to interpretation. Gordon believes them to be Semitic.

¹²⁰ EVANS (1935), EVANS – MYRES (1952), MYRES (1954), CARRATELLI (1945), CHARPOUTHIER (1930).

¹²¹ Cf. GORDON (1957a, 1957b, 1962a, 1962b, 1963).

¹²² Cf. PALMER (1958a, 1958b, 1962).

¹²³ Cf. HEUBECK (1961), KATIČIĆ (1964d).

¹²⁴ Cf. GEORGIEV (1955, 1957a). About this problem cf. also SCHACHERMEYER (1950), FURUMARK (1956), MERIGGI (1956), NEUMANN (1957, 1960–61), PERUZZI (1959, 1960a, 1960b).

¹²⁵ Cf. CONWAY (1901–02), GORDON (1962b, 1966).

On the island of Lemnos a stele has been found with a non-Greek inscription in Greek characters. This inscription is from the sixth century B.C. Four other inscriptions are preserved on vases, presumably in the same language. It seems that this language is related to Etruscan.¹²⁶ The whole complex of Etruscan becomes thus pertinent to Pre-Greek linguistics.¹²⁷

Important as these texts may be as direct testimonies to the existence of early Non-Greek and most probably Pre-Greek languages in the Aegean area, as things stand now, they offer very little data for the study of that linguistic stratum.

2.3.9 Aegean and Mediterranean

Some linguists view Aegean in a wider context. They maintain that four or five thousand years ago, languages of one family which they label *Mediterranean*, were in use in the whole area between the Atlantic and the Persian Gulf. To this family belong as its last survivals such isolated languages as Basque, Berber, Georgian and its cognates, and perhaps even the Dravidian languages. To this Mediterranean family belonged, all according to the views of these scholars, also Pelasgian (Pre-Greek) together with Etruscan and the Pre-Indo-European languages of Anatolia (Alarodian, Asianic).¹²⁸ The foundations of these theories are not very strong. They are based on homonymies and similarities of place names, and on rather shaky evidence of correspondences between Basque and Caucasian.

The homonymies and similarities of place names can well be illustrated by a classical example: the names *Iberes*, *Iberi*, and *Iberia* in the writings of ancient authors denote ethnic groups and

¹²⁶ Cf. TORP (1904), CORTSEN (1930), KRETSCHMER (1942), NICOSIA MARGANI (1954), ROSÉN (1954), PALLOTTINO (1963), RIX (1968).

¹²⁷ For an orientation concerning recent developments in that field cf. RIX (1963). For the non-Greek inscriptions on Cyprus (Eteocyprian), cf. SITTIG (1924).

¹²⁸ Cf. TROMBETTI (1926, 1942), ALESSIO (1954), DEVOTO (1954, 1961a, 1961b), HUBSCHMID (1960a, 1960b, 1961, 1966); also OŠTIR (1911–13, 1921, 1923, 1925, 1925–26, 1926–7, 1927a, 1927b, 1928, 1929, 1930) and LAHOVARY (1957).

countries in the Pyrenean peninsula and the Caucasus. The ancient Spanish river name *Hiber* occurs again on the Balkan as *Ibar* in Serbia and *Ibər* in Bulgaria. Some scholars derive this name from Basque *ibar* 'valley' or *ibai* 'river' and believe it is connected with the name of the Berbers. Such rather isolated similarities may easily be the result of pure chance and are certainly not evidence enough to establish an original linguistic unity of the Mediterranean area.

The correspondences of Basque and Georgian words are equally uncertain:

Basque <i>ituri</i>	'spring'	: Georgian <i>tk'aro</i>	'spring'
<i>bero</i>	'warm'	:	<i>bil</i> 'warm'
<i>hoge</i>	'twenty'	:	<i>oc-</i> 'twenty'
<i>ibili</i>	'to go'	:	<i>bilik</i> 'path'

Perhaps the whole Mediterranean hypothesis cannot be discarded altogether and some of the intuition of its supporters may be right, but it certainly does not rest on firm evidence and cannot help to elucidate the whole Pre-Greek complex. The Mediterranean theory must be approached with much critical care since its contentions are not yet verified and owing to the nature of the subject extremely difficult to verify.¹²⁹

¹²⁹ For a severe criticism of the Mediterranean hypotheses, cf. GEORGIEV (1958b: 174–; 1961: 48–; 1966a: 252–).

3. THE NORTHERN BORDER AREA

3.0 INTRODUCTION

As far as our present knowledge goes, Greek-speaking Indo-European tribes entered Hellas in two main waves: one about 1950 B.C., and the other about 1200 B.C. The older Greek layer appears in the sources under the name of 'Αχαιοί, originally 'Αχαιῶες. In the Homeric epics, this name for the Greeks appears consistently as a feature of deliberate archaizing. The country *Ahhijawa* of the Hittite sources may also be connected with this first Greek wave, although the issue has been very controversial.¹³⁰

The second layer is connected with the name of the Dorians (Δωριεῖς), which as an anachronism is found only once in the *Odyssey* (19.177). The Greek dialects as known from the inscriptions and from literature belong to these two strata: Arcado-Cypriot, Ionic, and Aeolic to the first, Dorian and North-West Greek to the second.¹³¹ The areal distribution of these dialects shows in general lines the directions of the migrations. Although for the first we have no direct evidence, it is reasonable to assume that it came from the north, from the mountains of the continental

¹³⁰ Cf. FORRER (1922, 1924a, 1924b, 1928, 1929, 1958), FRIEDRICH (1927), KRETSCHMER (1924, 1930, 1933b, 1933c, 1936, 1954), SOMMER (1932, 1934, 1937); cf. also SCHACHERMEYER (1935, 1958).

¹³¹ Cf. BUCK (1928), THUMB - KIECKERS (1932), THUMB - SCHERER (1959).

part of the peninsula, and even from the Danubian plains. Archaeological data confirm that from Neolithic times people and goods travelled that far and traces of cultural influences from the Danube can be detected in Aegean pre-history. They reached the Aegean area more than once.

The nebulous account of the historical sources leaves no doubt whatsoever that the Heraclides, the legendary representatives of the Dorians, came to the Peloponnesus from countries more to the north. And there are perhaps reasons to believe that non-Greek northern Indo-European tribes entered Greece with them.¹³²

The Greek language was brought to Hellas from what in classical times were the barbarian continental Balkans. That much we seem to know. But it is not easy to say what was left behind when speakers of Greek moved in successive waves to the south. Did people of non-Greek language come after them and settle on their cornfields and pastures or was the migration a powerful expansion in which only part of the Greek-speaking tribes went south while others remained and continued to settle in the north?

The answer to this question is vital for a correct picture of the linguistic situation on the ancient Balkans. Since the sources give no information for the time of the migrations themselves, one has to turn to classical times in order to see where the northern border of the Greek area was. But even in the full light of history the question remains a difficult and controversial one. It is amazingly difficult to establish whether the northern neighbours of classical Hellas spoke Greek or not. And political bias, ancient and modern, has not made it easier.

The border area in question belongs neither entirely to the Aegean nor to the northern continental world, but constitutes a transitional region with marked features of both. Politically it was organized, mostly under the rule of kings, into three more or less centralized confederations of tribes: Epirus, Macedonia, and Paonia. In the eyes of the Hellenes these peoples were barbarians first and became integrated only later into the Hellenic world.

¹³² Cf. BLUMENTHAL (1930).

But this cannot be conclusive for their language since the population of that area remained for many centuries isolated from the cultural development in the south, a development in which classical Hellas was born. When those who had gone to the south, after a long absorption in the wonders of the Aegean world, turned their eyes to the north, the kingdoms there must have seemed foreign to them and the language difficult to understand even if it was cognate and the heritage of their very ancestors. Thucydides states clearly that there were Greeks in language and descent who in their way of life were very similar to barbarians. Such peoples were the Locrians, the Aetolians, and the Acarnanians.¹³³

The general statements of Greek authors cannot help us here and we must look for specific information, which is very scarce and mostly inconclusive. The three countries of the border area have to be considered separately since each of them is in the ancient sources presented as an ethnic unit, in essence different from the others.

3.1 MACEDONIA

In Antiquity, Macedonia was, as it is now, the country to the north of mount Olympus in the valleys of the big rivers Haliacmon, Ludias, and the lower Axios. In the west its boundaries were Mount Boion (now *Grammos*) in the Pindus massive and the lake of Lychnis (now *Ohrid*). The northern and eastern boundary were less fixed, since the conquests of the Macedonian kings, especially those of Philip II, tended to displace them so that afterwards it was difficult to distinguish the boundaries of the country from the borders of the state. Generally speaking, one can say that the Pelagonian plain was divided between Macedonia and the Pela-

¹³³ Thucydides 1.5.3: καὶ μέχρι τοῦδε πολλὰ τῆς Ἑλλάδος τῷ παλαιῷ τρόπῳ νέμεται περί τε Λοκροὺς τοὺς Ὀζόλας καὶ Αἰτωλοὺς καὶ Ἀκαρνανίας καὶ τὴν ταύτην ἡπειρόν· τό τε σιδηροφορεῖσθαι τοῖς τοῖς ἡπειρώταις ἀπὸ τῆς παλαιᾶς ληστείας ἐμμεμένηκεν· πᾶσα γὰρ ἡ Ἑλλάς ἐσιδηροφόρει διὰ τὰς ἀφάρκτους τε οἰκῆσεις καὶ οὐκ ἀσφαλεῖς παρ' ἀλλήλους ἐφόδους, καὶ ξυνήθη τὴν διαίταν μεθ' ὅπλων ἐποίησαντο ὥσπερ οἱ βάρβαροι. — 1,6,6 πολλὰ δ' ἐν καὶ ἄλλα τις ἀποδείξειε τὸ παλαιὸν Ἑλληνικὸν ὁμοίότροπα τῷ νῦν βαρβαρικῷ διατρώμενον.

gonian part of Paeonia, and that through the Iron Gates (Demir Kapija) of the Axios this river passed from Paeonia into Macedonia. The boundary with the Thracian tribes in the east was first on the Strymon and on Mount Orbelos, then on the Nestos. Macedonian sovereignty was ultimately extended till the Hebrus, but we have no reason to suppose that this political expansion much affected the ethnic and linguistic substance of the Thracian population and the Hellenic settlers that inhabited these parts.

Ancient Macedonia was divided into an upper and a lower part. Lower Macedonia was the country in the plains on the sea-shore and around the mouths of the Macedonian rivers. In historical times it was organized as a strictly centralized kingdom whose capital was first in Aegae (Edessa) and afterwards in Pella. The names of the historical provinces of which it was constituted were: Ἡμαθία (which was thought to be the ancient name of Macedonia itself),¹³⁴ Πιερία, Ἀλμωπία, and Βοττιαία. Upper Macedonia was constituted by the fields and plateaus in the mountains surrounding the maritime plains. This rugged country was not easy to unify politically and there existed small autonomous kingdoms in a loose dependence of the big state in the plain. These highland communities were: Ἐλίμεια, Ἐορδαία, Ὀρεστίς, Λυγκηστίς, and Πελαγονία.¹³⁵ Thucydides says that in the lowlands the

¹³⁴ Cf. Strabo 7.frgm. 11: ὅτι Ἡμαθία ἐκαλεῖτο πρότερον ἢ νῦν Μακεδονία.

¹³⁵ Cf. Thucydides 2.99 (about the Thracian king Sitalkes and his army): ξυνηθροίζοντο οὖν ἐν τῇ Δοβήρῳ καὶ παρεσκευάζοντο ὅπως κατὰ κορυφὴν ἐσβαλοῦσιν ἐς τὴν κάτω Μακεδονίαν, ἧς ὁ Περδίκκας ἤρχεν. τῶν γὰρ Μακεδόνων εἰσὶ καὶ Λυγκησταὶ καὶ Ἐλιμιῶται καὶ ἄλλα ἔθνη ἐπάνωθεν, ἀ ξύμμαχα μὲν ἐστί τοῖς τοῖς ἐπὶ ἡπείρῳ, βασιλείας δ' ἔχει καθ' αὐτά. τὴν δὲ παρὰ θάλασσαν νῦν Μακεδονίαν Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Περδίκκου πατὴρ καὶ οἱ πρόγονοι αὐτοῦ Τημενίδαι τὸ ἀρχαῖον ὄντες ἐξ Ἀργεῶν πρώτοι ἐκτίσαντο καὶ ἐβασίλευσαν ἀναστήσαντες μάχη ἐκ μὲν Πιερίας Πίερας, οἱ ὕστερον ὑπὸ τὸ Πάργαιον πέραν Στρυμόνος ἔκτισαν Φάργγητα καὶ ἄλλα χωρία (καὶ ἔτι καὶ νῦν Πιερικὸς κόλπος καλεῖται ἢ ὑπὸ τῷ Παργαίῳ πρὸς θάλασσαν γῆ), ἐκ δὲ τῆς Βοττίας καλουμένης Βοττιαίους, οἱ νῦν ὁμοιοὶ Χαλκιδέων οἰκοῦσιν. τῆς δὲ Παιονίας παρὰ τὸν Ἀξίον ποταμὸν στενὴν τινα καθήκουσαν ἄνωθεν μέχρι Πέλλης καὶ θαλάσσης ἐκτίσαντο, καὶ πέραν Ἀξίου μέχρι Στρυμόνος τὴν Μυγδονίαν καλουμένην Ἠδῶνας ἐξελάσαντες νέμονται. ἀνέστησαν δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῆς νῦν Ἐορδαίας καλουμένης Ἐορδούς, ὧν οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ ἐφθάρησαν, βραχὺ δὲ τι αὐτῶν περὶ Φύσκαν κατόκηται, καὶ ἐξ Ἀλμωπίας Ἀλμωπας, ἐκράτησαν δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων

Macedonians were conquerors who had driven away the autochthonous population, mostly Thracians and Paeonians.¹³⁶

It seems that the Macedonians had descended from the highlands where their original strongholds had been. The autonomous kingdoms there which recognized the overlordship of the Temenid or Argead kings of Aegae and Pella were then the political communities from which they originated. Herodotus suggests in his legendary account of the foundation of the Macedonian kingdom that the Temenids came from the hills.¹³⁷ This is in accordance with another information given by Herodotus, namely that the Macedonians were originally Dorians and lived in the Pindus range.¹³⁸ He confirms at another place that Dorian and Macedonian were designations of one and the same ethnic complex.¹³⁹

The Macedonians were according to that tradition Dorian highlanders. The etymology of their name seems to confirm this:

ἔθνων οἱ Μακεδόνες οὗτοι ἃ καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἔχουσι, τὸν τε Ἀνθεμουῖντα καὶ Γρηστωνίαν καὶ Βισαλτίαν καὶ Μακεδόνων αὐτῶν πολλήν. τὸ δὲ ξύμπαν Μακεδονία καλεῖται καὶ Περδίκκας Ἀλεξάνδρον βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν ἦν ὅτε Σιτάλκης ἐπῆει. - Cf. further Strabo 7.fragm. 11: Πέλλα ἐστὶ μὲν τῆς κάτω Μακεδονίας ἣν Βοττιαῖοι κατεῖχον, and 7.7.8: καὶ δὴ καὶ τὰ περὶ Λύγκον καὶ Πελαγονίαν καὶ Ὀρεστιάδα καὶ Ἐλίμειαν τὴν ἄνω Μακεδονίαν ἐκάλουν οἱ δ' ὕστερον καὶ ἐλευθέραν.

¹³⁶ Thucydides 2.99; Cf. also Strabo 7.fragm. 11: κατεῖχον δὲ τὴν χώραν ταύτην Ἡπειρωτῶν τινες καὶ Ἰλλυριῶν, τὸ δὲ πλείστον Βοττιαῖοι καὶ Θρᾶκες οἱ μὲν ἐκ Κρήτης, ὡς φασι, τὸ γένος ὄντες, ἡγεμόνα ἔχοντες Βόττονα, Θρακῶν δὲ Πίερες μὲν ἐνέμοντο τὴν Πιερίαν καὶ τὰ περὶ τὸν Ὀλυμπον, Παίονες δὲ τὰ περὶ τὸν Ἀξιὸν ποταμὸν καὶ τὴν καλουμένην διὰ τοῦτο Ἀμφαξίτιν, Ἡδωνοὶ δὲ καὶ Βισάλται τὴν λοιπὴν μέχρι Στυμόνος ὃν οἱ μὲν αὐτὸ τοῦτο προσσηγορεύοντο Βισάλται, Ἡδωνῶν δ' οἱ μὲν Μυγδόνες, οἱ δὲ Ἡδωνες, οἱ δὲ Σίθωνες. τούτων δὲ πάντων οἱ Ἀργεάδαι καλούμενοι κατέστησαν κύριοι καὶ Χαλκιδεῖς οἱ ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ.

¹³⁷ Herodotus 8.137: ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν κήπων ὄρος κέεται Βέρμιον οὖνομα, ἄβαντον ὑπὸ χειμῶνος, ἐντεῦθεν δὲ ὀρμώμενοι, ὡς ταύτην ἔσχον, κατεστρέφοντο καὶ τὴν ἄλλην Μακεδονίην.

¹³⁸ Herodotus 1.56: ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ Δευκαλίωνος βασιλέως οἴκεε γῆν τὴν Φθιώτιν, ἐπὶ δὲ Δώρου τοῦ Ἑλλήνος τὴν ὑπὸ τὴν Ὀσσαν τε καὶ Ὀλυμπον χώραν, καλεομένην δὲ Ἰστιαίωτιν. ἐκ δὲ τῆς Ἰστιαίωτιδος ὡς ἐξανέστη ὑπὸ Κадμείων, οἴκεε ἐν Πίνδῳ Μακεδόνων καλούμενον. ἐντεῦθεν δὲ αὐτὶς ἐς τὴν Δρυοπίδα μετέβη, καὶ ἐκ τῆς Δρυοπίδος οὕτω ἐς Πελοπόννησον ἔλθον Δωρικῶν ἐκλήθη.

¹³⁹ Herodotus 8.43: [...] ἐόντες οὗτοι πλὴν Ἑρμιονέων Δωρικῶν τε καὶ Μακεδόνων ἔθνος, ἐξ Ἑριεοῦ τε καὶ Πίνδου καὶ τῆς Δρυοπίδος ὕστατα ὀρμηθέντες.

μακεδνός (and this is a form given to their name by Herodotus) means 'tall, taper', and Μακεδών (the usual form of their name) is but an apophonic alternant of the same word. It may refer to the high stature of the mountaineers, or perhaps to the high hills from which they originated. A Greek etymology of their name is thus possible but far from evident. The rarely used alternant form of this ethnic name is Μακέτης, a different derivation from the same root. Both forms, if this interpretation is correct, are cognates of Gr. μακρός 'long' and Lat. *macer* 'meagre, emaciated'.

The Macedonian kingdom of Aegae and afterwards of Pella expanded by conquest over the maritime plain from where various non-Greek and mostly Thracian and Paeonian tribes were expelled.¹⁴⁰ These regions were probably settled by the Macedonians themselves. Further to the east, beyond the Axios, the Macedonian expansion did not, as it seems, alter basically the Thracian character of the population. Whereas the Paeonians disappeared from the lower Axios almost without leaving a trace, the regions of Μυγδονία, Κρηστωνία, Σιντική, and Βισαλτία, between the Axios and the Strymon, not only kept the names of Thracian tribes, but were also inhabited by their descendents. East of the Strymon, the Ὀδόμαντες, Ἡδωνες, Σιντοί, Δερσαῖοι, Πίερες, and Σαπαῖοι, all Thracian tribes, lived under Macedonian rule.

Since the Persian wars Macedonia played an active part in Greek life and under Philip and Alexander became the leading power of the Greek world. It belongs thus fully to Greek history with which it is connected by numerous and manifold links. And yet, the question of the ethnic and linguistic affiliation of the Macedonians till the present day remains very controversial. The basic question that arises in this connection is, why anybody should doubt that the Macedonians were Greek in descent and language, given the geographical position of the country and the part it played in Greek history.¹⁴¹

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Thucydides 2.99 (quoted above in note 73).

¹⁴¹ Handy information about Macedonian history and topography is given by GEYER (1928), KALLERIS (1954), PAPAZOGLU (1957), DASKALAKIS (1965), ŠOFMAN (1960).

The reason for doubt that the Macedonians were of Greek stock and language is the fact that in antiquity itself there was no consensus whether they should be counted among the Hellenes or not. When in the Persian wars Macedonia came into closer contact with the Greek world, its king Alexander wished to take part in the Olympic games. The other competitors objected against the admission of a barbarian to the contest. But Alexander produced the traditional claim of his family to a descent from the ancient Heraclid kings of Argos and on its strength he was admitted to the games.¹⁴²

This shows beyond the slightest doubt that the claim to Hellenism of the Macedonian kings could in the fifth century B.C. be seriously challenged. And the legendary tradition with the help of which the king obtained his recognition as a Hellene, whatever its real worth, concerns only the royal family and not the whole people. Of course, in a genealogical model of history the descent of the ruling house may be meant to represent that of the whole community, but this remains pure guesswork.

When in the fourth century B.C. Macedonia began to play an ever increasing role in Greek affairs, Greek authors describe Macedonians often as barbarians.¹⁴³ Thrasymachus of Chalcedon, in the second half of the fifth century, calls Archelaus, king of Macedonia, quite explicitly a barbarian.¹⁴⁴ The barbarian king of Macedonia is here contrastively opposed to the Hellenes of Thessaly, and the border on the Peneios river appears as an ethnic and linguistic one.

¹⁴² Cf. Herodotus 5.22: "Ἕλληνας δὲ εἶναι τούτους τοὺς ἀπὸ Περδικέω γεγονότας, κατάπερ αὐτοὶ λέγουσι, αὐτὸς τε οὕτω τυγχάνω ἐπιστάμενος καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐν τοῖσι ὀπισθε λόγοισι ἀποδέξω ὡς εἰσὶ Ἕλληνες, πρὸς δὲ καὶ οἱ τὸν ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ διέποντες ἀγῶνα Ἑλλήνων οὕτω ἔγνωσαν εἶναι. Ἀλέξανδρον γὰρ ἀεθλεύειν ἐλομένον καὶ καταβάντος ἐπ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο οἱ ἀντιθεσόμενοι Ἑλλήνων ἔξεργόν μιν, φάμενοι οὐ βαρβάρων ἀγωνιστέον εἶναι τὸν ἀγῶνα ἀλλὰ Ἑλλήνων. Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ἐπειδὴ ἀπέδεξε ὡς εἴη Ἀργεῖος, ἐκρίθη τε εἶναι Ἕλληνα καὶ ἀγωνιζόμενος στάδιον συνεξέπιπτε τῷ πρώτῳ. — We can understand all too well the point of the competitors since Thucydides as a matter of course calls the tribes of upper Macedonia barbarians (cf. 4.124–127; perhaps also 2.80).

¹⁴³ Cf. DASKALAKIS (1965: part 5).

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Clemens Stromata 6.2.17: Θρασύμαχος ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ Λαρισιαίων λέγει Ἀρχελάφῳ δουλεύσομεν, Ἕλληνες ὄντες βαρβάρῳ;

Another writer of the end of the fifth century B.C., whose political speech to the Larissaeans about their relations to king Archelaus of Macedonia has been wrongly attributed to Herodes Atticus by the manuscripts, calls the Macedonians hostile barbarians.¹⁴⁵ Isocrates, a pro-Macedonian orator of the fourth century B.C., who extolls Philip of Macedonia as the future leader of all Hellenes against the Asians, says that the ancestor of the Macedonian king, the Argive prince, when he intended to establish an absolute rule, did not attempt this, like so many Greek tyrants, in his native city, but left the Hellenic world and went to Macedonia where he ruled over a foreign people.¹⁴⁶

More outspoken, of course, is Demosthenes, a contemporary of Isocrates, whose anti-Macedonian bias is well known. He asks rhetorically whether Philip is not a barbarian.¹⁴⁷ He says that in former times the kings of Macedonia were obedient to the Athenians as barbarians should be to Hellenes.¹⁴⁸ And he calls Philip not only a barbarian, but a deadly Macedonian from a country from which before one could not buy even a decent slave.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁵ Pseudo-Herodes, *Περὶ πολιτείας* 34–37: συμμάχους τε τοῖς Ἕλλησιν εἶναι, πολεμίους δὲ τοῖς βαρβάροις [...]. ἔπειτα τοῖς μὲν Ἕλλησι μὴ γίγνεσθαι συμμάχους, τοῖς δὲ βαρβάροις καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο τοῖς ἐχθροτάτοις [...]

¹⁴⁶ Philippus 106–108: ὁ γὰρ πατήρ σου πρὸς τὰς πόλεις ταύτας, αἷς σοὶ παραινῶ προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν, πρὸς ἀπάσας οἰκείως εἶχεν ὅτε κτησάμενος τὴν ἀρχήν, μείζον φρονήσας τῶν αὐτοῦ πολιτῶν καὶ μοναρχίας ἐπιθυμήσας, οὐχ ὁμοίως ἐβουλεύσατο τοῖς πρὸς τὰς τοιαύτας φιλοτιμίας ὀρμωμένοις. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐν ταῖς αὐτῶν πόλεσι στάσεις καὶ ταραχὰς καὶ σφαγὰς ἐμποιοῦντες, ἐκτῶντο τὴν τιμὴν ταύτην, ὁ δὲ τὸν μὲν τόπον τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν ὅλως εἶασε, τὴν δ' ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ βασιλείαν κατασχέειν ἐπεθύμησε. ἠπίστατο γὰρ τοὺς μὲν Ἕλληνας οὐκ εἰθισμένους ὑπομένειν τὰς μοναρχίας, τοὺς δ' ἄλλους οὐ δύναμένους ἀνευ τῆς τοιαύτης δυναστείας διοικεῖν τὸν βίον τὸν σφέτερον αὐτῶν. καὶ γὰρ τοι συνέβη διὰ τὸ γνῶναι περὶ τούτων αὐτὸν ἰδίως καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν γεγενῆσθαι πολὺ τῶν ἄλλων ἐξηλλαγμένην μόνος γὰρ τῶν Ἑλλήνων οὐχ ὁμοφύλου γένους ἄρχειν ἀξιώσας, μόνος καὶ διαφρυγῆναι ἠδυνήθη τοὺς κινδύνους τοὺς περὶ τὰς μοναρχίας γιγνομένους [...]

¹⁴⁷ Olynth. 3.16: οὐ βάρβαρος.

¹⁴⁸ Olynth. 3.24: [...] ὑπήκουεν δ' ὁ ταύτην τὴν χώραν ἔχων βασιλεὺς, ὥσπερ ἐστὶ προσήκον βαρβαρον Ἕλλησι [...]

¹⁴⁹ Philipp. 3.31: Ἄλλ' οὐχ ὑπὲρ Φιλίππου καὶ ὧν ἐκεῖνος πράττει νῦν, οὐχ οὕτως ἔχουσιν, οὐ μόνον οὐχ Ἕλληνας ὄντος οὐδὲ προσήκοντος οὐδὲν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ βαρβάρου ἐντεῦθεν ὅθεν καλὸν εἰπεῖν, ἀλλ' ὀλέθρου Μακεδόνας ὅθεν οὐδ' ἀνδράποδον σπουδαῖον οὐδὲν ἦν πρότερον πρῆσθαι.

We learn also that other public speakers, too, used to call Philip a barbarian. Thus Aeschynes, a known Athenian partisan of Macedonia, in an earlier phase of his political career launched the same reproach against Philip.¹⁵⁰

If we add to all this that Curtius Rufus describes a scene in which the difference between Greek and the ancestral speech of the Macedonians plays a role,¹⁵¹ one cannot wonder that the question of the ancient Macedonian language and of the ethnological substance of the Macedonians arose among scholars.

In view of these testimonies such a question is quite legitimate. It remained controversial because the evidence from ancient literature is not conclusive. Many centuries before the Persian wars, the Macedonians lived in complete isolation from the life of Hellas and in their northern mountain recesses did not participate in its cultural growth. They were certainly no Hellenes in the specific cultural sense, even if they were of Greek stock, and if they spoke Greek, their dialect must have, because of the lack of continuous contact, presented many peculiarities. The designation of the Macedonians as barbarians may thus refer just to this cultural isolation and backwardness, to the unfamiliarity of an uncultivated dialect, without implying their being completely foreign, culturally and linguistically. It may, of course, be so, but it also may not. It is quite possible that by *barbarians*, as usual, a people is meant with a foreign language and an alien culture.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. what Demosthenes, *Περὶ παραπρεσβείας* 305, says about Aeschynes: *βάρβαρον τε γὰρ πολλάκις καὶ ἀλάστορα τὸν Φίλιππον ἀποκαλῶν ἐδημηγόρει, [...]*

¹⁵¹ Curtius Rufus 6.9.37: *Iamque rex intuens eum "Macedones, inquit, de te iudicaturi sunt: quaero, an patrio sermone sis apud eos usus". Tum Philotas "Praeter Macedonas, inquit, plerique adsunt, quos facilius, quae dicam, percepturos arbitror, si eadem lingua fuero usus, qua tu egisti, non ob aliud, credo, quam ut oratio tua intellegi posset a pluribus." Tum rex "Ecquid videtis odio etiam sermonis patrii Philotan teneri? solus quippe fastidiit eum discere."* – And further 6.10.22: *Mihi quidem obicitur quod societatem patrii sermonis asperner, quod Macedonum mores fastidiam [...]* *Iam pridem natus ille sermo commercio aliarum gentium exolevit: iam victoribus quam victis peregrina lingua discenda est.*

There are, of course, other instances in which the ancient writers designate the Macedonians explicitly as Hellenes, just as one would expect, having in view the part they played in history, but these informations too, cannot bring us nearer to a safe conclusion since they either refer to the dynasty, which according to legend was of Argive descent, or to a later time in which Macedonia culturally and linguistically had beyond the slightest doubt become undistinguishable from Hellas proper.

Herodotus had no doubt that the descendants of Perdiccas, i.e. the royal house of Macedonia, were true Hellenes from the stock of the Heraclids that ruled Argos.¹⁵² Polybius thinks it more correct to incorporate Macedonian enterprises into the main current of Greek history than the reverse.¹⁵³ This is really no more than a testimony to the intimate interconnection of Greek and Macedonian history. To Polybius, Hellas included Macedonia and the Macedonians were Hellenes.¹⁵⁴ He introduces political speeches in which warnings are contained against hostility of Greeks towards Greeks, when Macedonians are meant, and they are referred to as being of the same stock.¹⁵⁵ Appian views Macedonia as the shield of Hellas against northern barbarism.¹⁵⁶ Strabo says

¹⁵² Cf. Herodotus 5.22 and 8.137–139. By identifying the Macedonians with the Dorians he designates them explicitly as Hellenes, 1.56:

ἱστορέων δὲ εὗρισκε Λακεδαιμονίους καὶ Ἀθηναίους προέχοντας, τοὺς μὲν τοῦ Δωριεοῦ γένεος, τοὺς δὲ τοῦ Ἰωνικοῦ. ταῦτα γὰρ ἦν τὰ προκεκριμένα, ἔόντα τὸ ἀρχαῖον τὸ μὲν Πελασγικόν, τὸ δὲ Ἑλληνικὸν ἔθνος. καὶ τὸ μὲν οὐδαμῇ κω ἐξεχώρησε, τὸ δὲ πολυπλάνητον κάρτα. ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ Λευκαλίωνος βασιλέος οἴκεε γῆν τὴν Φθιώτιν, ἐπὶ δὲ Δώρου τοῦ Ἑλλήνος τὴν ὑπὸ τὴν Ὀσσαν τε καὶ τὸν Ὀλυμπον χώρην, καλεομένην Ἰστιαιώτιν. ἐκ δὲ τῆς Ἰστιαιώτιδος ὥς ἐξανέστη ὑπὸ Κασμείων, οἴκεε ἐν Πίνδῳ Μακεδόνων καλεόμενον.

¹⁵³ Polybius 8.11.4: *πολλῶ σεμνότερον ἢ καὶ δικαιότερον ἐν τῇ περὶ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὑποθέσει τὰ πεπραγμένα Φιλίππου συμπεριλαβεῖν ἢ περὶ ἐν τῇ Φιλίππου τὰ τῆς Ἑλλάδος.*

¹⁵⁴ Polybius 7.9.1: *Μακεδονίαν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην Ἑλλάδα [...]* *Μακεδόνες καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων οἱ σύμμαχοι.*

¹⁵⁵ Polybius 5.103.9: *[...] δεῖν μάλιστα μὲν μηδέποτε πολεμεῖν τοὺς Ἑλλήνας ἀλλήλοις [...];* 9.37.7: *τότε μὲν γὰρ ὑπὲρ ἡγεμονίας καὶ δόξης ἐφιλοτιμείσθε πρὸς Ἀχαιοὺς καὶ Μακεδόνας ὁμοφύλους [...]*

¹⁵⁶ Appian, *Macedonica* 9: *τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν ἔθνη πολλὰ βάρβαρα τὴν Μακεδονίαν περικάθηται, εἰ τις ἐξέλαι τοὺς Μακεδόνων βασιλέας, ἐπιδραμεῖται ῥᾶδιως.*

that Macedonia is undoubtedly Greece¹⁵⁷ and Livius refers to the Macedonians as being of the same language as the Greek Aetolians and Acarnanians.¹⁵⁸

None of these testimonies can surprise us because of the time to which they refer. And therefore they cannot exclude the possibility that the Macedonians were originally ethnically and linguistically separate. The historical evidence does not allow us thus to decide whether the Macedonians were originally of Greek stock or not.

We turn now to what can be known about the Macedonian language. It is not much. No text has been preserved. All the Macedonian documents known to us are written in Attic Greek. A characteristic example are the letters of king Philip quoted in a Laris-sean decree the original text of which is in pure Thessalian. The texts of the Macedonian chancellery, on the contrary, are in exquisite Attic.¹⁵⁹ The only information we have on the language of the Macedonians comes from the ancient lexicographers who mark some glosses as Macedonian. Most of this tradition goes back to the work of Amerias, a lexicographer of Macedonian origin. We know thus only isolated Macedonian words without context and, what is especially to be regretted, without inflexion.

Etymologically these words can be classified into three main groups. One is formed by the words which are patently Greek, such as:

ἄγημα 'the royal Guard', a special body in the Macedonian army. In Laconian Greek the word refers to the division which marches at the head of the army, the leading troop, and that is the original meaning of this substantive which is derived from ἡγεομαι 'lead' (Dor. ἀγέομαι)¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁷ Strabo 7.7.1.

¹⁵⁸ Livius 31.29: *Aetolos, Acarnanas, Macedonas, eiusdem linguae homines.*

¹⁵⁹ Cf. IG 9.2.517.

¹⁶⁰ For this and the following examples of words recorded as Macedonian in the ancient lexicographic tradition, cf. the full presentations by HOFFMANN (1906, 1928), KALLERIS (1954), PUDIĆ (1966–67).

ἀγκαλῖς	'sickle' from Gr. ἀγκάλη 'bent arm'
ἄκρουνοί	'border stones' from Gr. ἄκρον 'end, extremity' with the suffix -ωνο- in a dialectal sound form
ἀργίπους	'eagle'; cf. Homeric ἀργίποδες κύνες 'swift-footed dogs'
γύαλας	'cup'; cf. Gr. γύαλον 'hollow'
δαίτας	'divide'; cf. Gr. Ἰσοδαίτης 'dividing equally' as epitheton of various deities
ἑταῖροι	'the cavalry guards of the Macedonian kings', which is but the Greek word ἑταῖρος 'comrade'
ἡνδέα	'noon', which is a dialectal form of Gr. ἑνδιος
καρπαῖα	'a dance'; cf. Gr. καρπάλιμος 'swift'
κομιμάραι	'shrimps', which is a dialectal form of Dorian κάμμιαι
κόραυνος	'ruler', derived from the homonymous mythical first king of the Macedonians; cf. Gr. κοίρανος
νικάτωρ	'conqueror'; cf. Attic νικητήρ
ῥάματα	'grapes'; cf. Gr. ῥᾶγες 'grapes'
σαυτορία	'salvation'; cf. Attic σωτηρία
ταγοναγία	'a Macedonian magistrate'; cf. Thessalian ταγός 'a magistrate'
τελεσίαις	'a dance'; cf. Gr. τελεσι- 'ending'
χάρων	'lion'; cf. Homeric χαροποί λέοντες 'fierce lions'

Some of these words with unmistakable Greek affiliations can very easily be loans, especially the technical terms. Others show some interesting dialectal traits in sound pattern and derivation and suggest thus a much deeper layer of the Macedonian vocabulary. Of course, they may also represent an older stratum of borrowing, one that resulted from contacts with the neighbouring Greek communities which took place before Macedonia came under the strong influence of the highest forms of Hellenic culture. Yet, such assumptions remain highly conjectural. The possibility that some of these words belong to another Indo-European lan-

guage which in some details at least is very close to Greek can also not be totally excluded.

Other Macedonian words are such that no connection with Greek could as yet be established. Some of them are:

ἄβαγνα	'roses'
ἄλιζα	'white leprosy of the trees' ¹⁶¹
ἄλίη	'boar'
ἄξος	'wood'
βαβρήν	'lees of olive-oil'
βέδν	'air'
γόδα	'intestines'
γοτάν	'a pig' (acc.)
δάρυλλος	'oak'
ἰζέλα	'good luck'
καυσία	'Macedonian heat'
λακεδάμα	'salt water drunk by Macedonian peasants'
σάρισσα	'long pike'
σιγύνη, σίγυννος	'spear' ¹⁶²

¹⁶¹ In the codices of Hesychius the meaning is given as ἡ λεύκη τῶν δένδρων which can without difficulty be understood as 'white leprosy of the trees'. Some scholars have from there restituted ἡ λεύκη τὸ δένδρον 'abele the tree' since λεύκη designs the white poplar tree also. Accepting this restitution, BARIĆ (1926: 221) and KRETSCHMER (1927b: 305) have proposed an interesting etymological equation with IE **alisā* which exists also in Russ. *olbxa* which has been taken as a proof of non-Greek Indo-European descent (consider the passage of intervocalic -s- into -z- instead of zero, as would be regular in Greek).

With all due respect for the acumen of these distinguished linguists, it must be stressed that this etymology is based on a conjectural meaning and that the Indo-European sound complex in the other cognate words such as OHG *elira*, Lat. *alnus*, OCS *jelbxa* is by no means clear enough to make such an explanation of the Macedonian word as evident as its proponents claim it to be. KALLERIS (1954: 90-) criticises rightly BARIĆ's and KRETSCHMER's etymology and quotes all others that have been proposed. His own, according to which ἄλιζα is Greek and has to be connected with ἀλφός 'dull-white leprosy', is based on a root equation of only two phonemic correspondences and a quite unclear derivational model. It remains therefore a guess of low probability.

¹⁶² KALLERIS (1954) proposes for many of these words Greek etymologies which he himself regards only as hypothetical attempts.

Since our knowledge of ancient Greek is far from complete, every one of these words can be Greek with cognates unattested in our sources.

A third and most interesting group of Macedonian glosses is composed of words which have obvious Greek cognates but differ from them in their phonemic shape to an extent which goes far beyond the limits of dialectal variation in ancient Greek. Such words are:

ἄδῃ	'sky'; cf. Gr. αἰθήρ 'ether, heaven'
ἄδραῖα	'clear sky'; cf. Gr. αἶθρα
δάνος	'death'; cf. Gr. θάνατος
δανέω	'kill'; cf. Gr. θανεῖν
κεβαλά	'head'; cf. Gr. κεφαλή
ἄβροῦτες	(probably corrupted from ἄβροῦτες) 'eyebrows'; cf. Gr. ὀφρύες
γαλάδρα	'ravine', from the toponym
Γαλάδραι,	a town in Pieria or Eordaea, cf. Gr.
Χαράδρα	'ravine'. (Cf. PETRUŠEVSKI [1966:310].)

Here we observe sound correspondences between Greek θ φ and Macedonian δ β; Greek αι before consonant and Macedonian α; Greek ο and Macedonian α; a nominative singular of *r*-stems without the final sonant, as in OI *māiā* 'mother' and Lith. *duktė* 'daughter'.

The examples for these sound correspondences are few and one would be inclined to think that the supposed equations are but a complex of coincidences if the ancient Greeks had not made the same observation regarding the language of the Macedonians. They noticed that the Macedonians turned φ into β and spoke Βέροια instead of Φέροια, Βάλακρος instead of Φάλακρος, Βερενίκη instead of Φερενίκη, and Βίλιππος instead of Φίλιππος, κεβαλή 'head' instead of κεφαλή.¹⁶³ This is a very important difference between Macedonian and all Greek dialects.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶³ Cf. Etymologicum Magnum and Stephanus Byzantinus s.v. Βέροια.

¹⁶⁴ KALLERIS (1954: 85) announces his complete repudiation of these sound correspondences, but unfortunately the full discussion of the problem is to come in the second volume which has not been published yet.

Hatzidakis thinks that β and δ stand for voiced fricatives as in Modern Greek and that their voicing in Macedonian is late and secondary, there being thus no isogloss with those Indo-European languages which turned their voiced aspirate stops into voiced unaspirated ones. This he tries to demonstrate on the strength of the word κεβαλά from IE *g^hebhalā in which the first aspirate lost its aspiration by dissimilation while still unvoiced, just as in any Greek dialect. But since his assumption is based essentially on this one example, one cannot be sure that this Macedonian word was not reshaped on the Greek model while the real Macedonian form was γαβαλά, preserved in Hesychius without an ethnicon.¹⁶⁵

All these words show that Macedonian was somehow close to Greek, but also considerably different from it. The words of the first and of the second group may in reality constitute but one, which in that case can be regarded as dialectal Greek. We know for the time being only some lexical morphs of the Macedonian language, while the grammatical ones remain unknown since no Macedonian text has been preserved. The grammatical morphs are essential for the genetical classification of a language as a whole, as opposed to its single words, and we are therefore unable to decide which one of the groups mentioned above determines the genetical affiliation of Macedonian.¹⁶⁶ In other words, we cannot decide which of these words are inherited and which are loans.

The situation being such, the data of onomastics become extremely important. The Macedonian personal names are Greek in their vast majority, at least as far as they are preserved to us. Their shape is nonetheless quite different from current classical anthroponymy in the Hellenic world and shows some dialectal features reminding of the Thessalian tradition. Such names are:

- 'Αγέρρος (short form of Gr. 'Αγέρωχος)
- 'Αδαῖος (short form of Gr. 'Αδάμας)
- 'Αέροπος (Greek mythological name)

¹⁶⁵ Cf. HATZIDAKIS (1900: 318-9).

¹⁶⁶ Cf. KATIČIĆ (1970: 118-)

- Αἴσυμνος (Homeric name)
- 'Αλέξανδρος (Gr. ἀλέξω 'ward off'; ἀνὴρ 'man')
- 'Αλκάνωρ (Gr. ἀλκή 'prowess', ἀνὴρ 'man')
- 'Αλκέτας (popular Greek name)
- 'Αμύντας (Gr. ἀμύνω 'keep off', common Greek name)
- 'Αμύντωρ (the same)
- 'Αντίοχος (Gr. ἀντί 'against', ἔχω 'keep')
- 'Αρραβαῖος (cf. Gr. 'Αρραφάνης)
- 'Αρσινόη (cf. Gr. ἄρσαι 'join, fit together', νόος 'mind')
- Βάλακρος (cf. Gr. φαλακρός 'bald headed')
- Βερενίκα (cf. Gr. φέρω 'carry', νίκη 'victory')
- Βίλιππος (cf. Gr. φίλος 'dear', ἵππος 'horse')
- Βοραῖος (cf. Gr. Φοραῖος)
- Βρίσων (Gr. βρίθω 'to be heavy with'; cf. Gr. Λύσων and λύω 'unfasten')
- Βρομερός (cf. Gr. βρόμος 'roaring')
- Δρωπίδας (Solon's brother had the same name)
- Θῦνος (Gr. θῦνος 'war')
- Κάρανος (cf. Gr. κοίρανος 'ruler')
- Κεβαλῖνος (cf. Gr. Κεφαλῖνος)
- Κοῖνος (cf. Gr. κοινός 'common')
- 'Οφέλλας (cf. Gr. 'Οφέλλανδρος)
- Παρμενίων (cf. Gr. Παρμενίδης)
- Περδίκκας (cf. Gr. Πέρδιξ (mythical name))
- Πτολεμαῖος (Homeric name)
- Σάθων (Dorian name; cf. Gr. σάθῃ 'penis')
- Σέλευκος (cf. Gr. λευκός 'white' and the name Ζάλευκος)
- Φιλώτας (cf. Gr. φίλος 'dear')
- Χάρος (short form of a Greek name in Χαρo-)

Only a few names like Βυργῖνος, 'Επόκιλλος, Σαββαταρᾶς, and Τεύταμος do not seem to be Greek.¹⁶⁷

The toponyms of Macedonia, as can be expected, suggest a considerable variety of etymological affiliations. The many non-

¹⁶⁷ Cf. HOFFMANN (1906, 1928).

Greek analogies remain, of course, very vague since the languages in question (Illyrian, Thracian, Phrygian) are themselves very little and only fragmentarily known.¹⁶⁸ Since place names are very stable and usually represent an old linguistic stratum, it is important that in Macedonia occur such which can unmistakably be recognized as Greek words. Such are the names of towns:

Ἀκεσαμεναί	(Gr. ἀκέομαι 'heal, cure')
Ἀλαλκομεναί	(Gr. ἀλαλκεῖν 'protect')
Ἀταλάντη	(Gr. ἀτάλαντος 'equal in weight')
Δῖον	(Gr. δῖος 'heavenly')
Εἰδομένη	(Gr. εἶδομαι 'appear, shine')
Εὐρωπός	(Gr. εὐρωπός 'broad')

Especially in the valley of the Haliacmon river, the region from which the Macedonian power spread over the neighbouring lands, the toponyms can easily be interpreted as Greek. Such are the rivers Ἀλιάκμων (Gr. ἀλινδέω 'make to roll', ἄκμων 'meteoric stone, anvil', 'rolling stones'); Βόρβορος (Gr. βόρβορος 'mire, filth'); Ὀλγανος (< Φόλγανος, cf. OCS *vlaga* < **volga* 'humidity'); further the *Castoris lacus* (Gr. κάστωρ 'beaver') and the towns Ἄργος Ὀρεστικόν; Αἰγανέη (Gr. αἶξ 'goat', in the same region; cf. the Slavic toponym *Kožane*, from *koza* 'goat'); *Celetrum* (Gr. κελέτρα 'a configuration of the terrain').¹⁶⁹

The evidence at our disposal being such it is no wonder that the opinions of scholars on the language of the Macedonians have been divided. Some believe that their language was not Greek and more or less related to that of their northern neighbours.¹⁷⁰ Other scholars maintain that Macedonian was a Greek dialect or a

¹⁶⁸ For "Illyrian", cf. KRAHE (1935). A general analysis in DURIDANOV (1968a).

¹⁶⁹ Cf. GEORGIEV (1961: 24-5, 1966a: 189-90).

¹⁷⁰ Cf. MÜLLER (1825), G. MEYER (1875), THUMB (1907), THUMB - KIECKERS (1932), VASMER (1908), KACAROV (1910a, 1910b), BEŠEVLEV (1932), BUDIMIR (1934-35), PISANI (1937), RUSSU (1938), BARIĆ (1948), POGHIRC (1960), CHANTRAINE (1966).

language very much related to Greek and separated from it only by a long and almost complete cultural isolation.¹⁷¹

With the evidence at our disposal, the problem cannot be solved in any valid and final way. Yet, the personal names, Greek in their vast majority, but in many cases not belonging to current Greek onomastics or displaying dialectal traits, make it very probable that the Macedonians, as opposed to the population they subdued and ruled, spoke a variety of Greek, or at least, an Indo-European language closely related to it, as two Slavic or two Germanic languages are to each other. This latter possibility cannot be completely ruled out because of the peculiar phonological correspondences between Greek words and Macedonian glosses.

One has tried to support the view that Macedonian was a Greek dialect by general reasoning. It has been said that a people which has conquered the whole world could impossibly have renounced the use of its language and that the Macedonians could have become the founders and promoters of Hellenism only if they were Hellenes themselves.¹⁷² However plausible this may seem at first glance, it is not true because what in this reasoning is deemed impossible, actually happened. Whatever the language of the Macedonians might have been, a Greek dialect or a foreign language, it remains a fact that at the latest since Philip II they used officially only the Attic dialect, while every Greek state clung jealously to its own. And whether the Macedonians were of Greek stock or not, for Hellenes they were a foreign people. Even Plutarchus asserts it, who, writing in the second century A.D. about Aratus, an Achaean general of the third century B.C., states that the Hellenes always regarded the Macedonian rule as foreign and

¹⁷¹ Cf. STURZ (1808), FICK (1866, 1874), KRETSCHMER (1896, 1927b), HATZIDAKIS (1897, 1900, 1928), HOFFMANN (1906, 1928), SOLMSEN (1907), LESNY (1909), BUCK (1928), MAYER (1952), KALLERIS (1954), GEORGIEV (1961, 1966). Full bibliography in KALLERIS (1954), POGHIRC (1960), DASKALAKIS (1965), PUDIĆ (1966).

¹⁷² Cf. HOFFMANN (1906: iii), KALLERIS (1954: 47-52), DASKALAKIS (1965: 91).

imported from abroad.¹⁷³ If nevertheless we contend that Macedonian probably was a Greek dialect or at least a language very closely related to Greek, it is only on the strength of Macedonian onomastics, especially the personal names, which support such a view.

The whole complex remains obscure and the question open, until some original Macedonian text has been found. And it is without good reason that some authors try to suggest that any scholar doubting that the Macedonians were of Greek origin is either not well informed or of ill will.

3.2 PAEONIA

The Paeonians were a people that since oldest times settled on the Axios river. Their town was Amydon or Abydon.¹⁷⁴ Its site was near the sea; we can thus conclude that the Paeonians originally lived on the sea shore near the lower Axios.¹⁷⁵ From there they were expelled by the Macedonians.¹⁷⁶ Herodotus mentions them on the lower Strymon. In his time they also occupied a vast stretch of the interior around Lake Prasias and the Pangaion mountain and also between the rivers Strymon and Nestos. In later times, all these regions were settled by Thracians and ruled by Macedonia. The Paeonians were then its northern neighbours on the middle Axios and in the valleys of its left and right tributaries in the surroundings of the modern towns of Veles, Prilep, and Štip. The border with Macedonia was on the Iron Gate (Demir

¹⁷³ Vita Arati 16: *Ἐναντῶ δὲ ὕστερον αὐθις στρατηγῶν ἐνίστατο τὴν περὶ τὸν Ἀκροκόρινθον πρᾶξιν, οὗ Σικωνίων οὐδ' Ἀχαιῶν κηδόμενος, ἀλλὰ κοινὴν τινὰ τῆς Ἑλλάδος τυραννίδα, τὴν Μακεδόνων φρουρὰν, ἐκεῖθεν ἐξελάσαι διανοούμενος [...]* ταύτην δὲ τὴν πρᾶξιν οὐκ ἂν ἀμάρτοι τις ἀδελφὴν προσειπὼν τῆς Πελοπίδου τοῦ Θηβαίου καὶ Θρασυβούλου τοῦ Ἀθηναίου τυραννοκτονίας, πλήν ὅτι τῷ μὴ πρὸς Ἕλληνας, ἀλλὰ ἐπακτὸν ἀρχὴν γερονέειν καὶ ἀλλόφυλλον αὐτῇ διήνεγκεν.

¹⁷⁴ Il. 2.848–49: *αὐτὰρ Πυραϊχμης ἄγε Παίονας ἀγκυλοτόξους τηλόθεν ἐξ Ἀμυδῶνος, ἀπ' Ἀξιοῦ ἐκρὺ ῥέοντος [...]*; cf. also 16.287–8; 21.141–60.

¹⁷⁵ Cf. Strabo 7.fragm. 20 and 41.

¹⁷⁶ Thucydides 2.99.

Kapija) of the Axios (Vardar) north of the modern town of Gevgelija. From Dardania, Paeonia was separated by the mountains through which the Axios passes from the field of Scupi (modern Skopje) to the valley of Bylazora (Veles).

The relations of Paeonia to Macedonia were hostile and Paeonia lost its independence to Philip II, but remained a separate kingdom under its own rulers. The Macedonians annexed some Paeonian territory around the town of Stobi north of the Iron Gate.

To the ancient writers Paeonia was a separate ethnic individuality between Illyria, Thrace, and the Macedonians. In the Iliad they appear as Trojan allies and were thus regarded as barbarians. But on their broader ethnic affiliation there is a disconcerting variety of traditions. Homer mentions them in the catalogue of the Trojan auxiliaries together with the Thracians and the Thracian Kikones. Strabo describes them as Thracians. In another passage he connects them with the Phrygians.¹⁷⁷ Herodotus and Thucydides distinguish them from the Thracians.¹⁷⁸ Herodotus mentions a tradition according to which the Paeonians are Teucrian settlers from Troy.¹⁷⁹ Appian, on the other hand, knows a genealogy in which Paion, the eponym of the Paeonians, is the son of Autarieus, the eponym of the Illyrian Autariatae, and father of Skordiskos and Triballos, the eponyms of two central Balkanic tribes, one Celtic and the other, as far as we know, Thracian.¹⁸⁰ This connects the Paeonians with the Illyrian complex, although instead of them the Pannonians may be meant, since Appian uses the Paeonian name also to denote that ethnic group. Another genealogy connects the Paeonians with the Peloponnesian Epeians: Paion is the son of Endymion and brother of Epeios and Aitolos. The brothers ran a race for the throne at Olympia. Epeios won and Paion, vexed at his defeat, went to the region beyond the river Axios, and after

¹⁷⁷ Cf. 7.fragm. 11 and 37: *Τοὺς δὲ Παίονας οἱ μὲν ἀποίκους Φρυγῶν οἱ δ' ἀρχηγῆτας ἀποφαίνουσι.*

¹⁷⁸ Cf. Herodotus 7.185 and Thucydides 2.98.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. Herodotus 5.13.

¹⁸⁰ Cf. Appian, Illyrica 2; PAPAZOGLU (1969: 54–64, 97–100, 265–72)

him that country was named Paeonia.¹⁸¹ This version establishes for the Paeonians a Greek affiliation. In the light of these conflicting statements it is difficult to decide what kind of language the Paeonians spoke. As far as literary evidence goes, Paeonia is a blank on the linguistic map of the ancient Balkans.¹⁸²

Purely linguistic evidence does not help much further. The only Paeonian gloss preserved by ancient writers is *μόναπος* 'European bison', the noblest game of the Paeonians.¹⁸³ This does not tell much. Even onomastic data do not help us to get further. The name of the Paeonian tribes (*Σιροπαῖονες*, *Παιόπλαι*, *Δόβηρες*, *Λαιαῖοι*, and *Ἀγριᾶνες*) cannot be assigned definitely to any language. The same holds true for the names of their towns: *Βυλάζωρα*, *Στόβοι*, and *Ἀστιβος*. The last one is homonymous with Gr. *ἄστιβος* 'untrodden', but this correspondence is very much suspect for paronymological adaptation or chance similarity. *Δευρίσπος*, a western part of Paeonia in the north of the Pelagonian plain, can be interpreted as Greek only by a tour de force (it has by some scholars been connected with the name of the Dorians), whereas the town of *Ἀλκομεναί*, which lay in that region, has a name which looks quite Greek, but another (*Στύβηρα*) has not. The names of the towns on the lower Axios already mentioned (*Εἰδομένη*, *Ἀταλάντη*, *Εὐρωπος*) have a Greek appearance, and even *Γορτυνία*, although it has no Greek etymology, belongs definitely to Greek toponymy. However, we cannot be sure that these towns were named with Paeonian words. The unstable settlement of the region of the Axios, the Erigon, and the Strymon makes every judgment on the Paeonian language based on toponomastics highly problematic.

The only Paeonian anthroponyms we know something about are names of the members of the ruling house and other illustrious persons. These are in many cases purely Greek (*Ἄγις*, *Ἀρίστων*, *Λέων*). In other cases the names can be interpreted as Greek, but do not belong to current Greek onomastics or show some foreign

¹⁸¹ Cf. Pausanias 5.1.3–5.

¹⁸² About Paeonia, cf. LENK (1942) and MERKER (1965).

¹⁸³ Cf. Aristotle, *Historia animalium* 9.45.

feature which makes it impossible to regard them without reserve as purely Greek: *Λύκκειος*/*Λύππειος*/*Λύκπειος*,¹⁸⁴ *Ἀδωλέων* (hellenized by Greek writers as *Ἀυτολέων*). Names as *Δρωπίων* and *Πάτραος* may and may not be Greek since important analogies can be found in the northern Balkans. Other Paeonian personal names: *Λάγγαρος*, *Πίγρης*, *Μαντύης* (other variant forms: *Μαστύης* and *Μαστίης*), and *Didas* – are certainly not Greek. The Paeonian Dionysos was called *Δύαλος* and this name, too, does not seem to be Greek. One is, on the contrary, tempted to equate it as a cognate with Greek *θύω* 'rage, seethe'.

The evidence at our disposal being so extremely scarce and contradictory it is only natural that scholars interested in the subject have expressed a variety of opinions. It is quite clear that the Paeonians were never Hellenes in any cultural sense. Nevertheless, some scholars believe them to be of Greek stock and their language to be another Greek dialect.¹⁸⁵ Others think that the Paeonians were not Greek. The prevailing opinion is that they were "Illyrian", i.e., form a part of the linguistic complex of the ancient north-western Balkans.¹⁸⁶ Still other scholars believe them to be Thracian¹⁸⁷ or Phrygian.¹⁸⁸

We know so little about their language that any assertion as to their linguistic affiliations seems meaningless.¹⁸⁹ The general impression is that they did not speak Greek, but had very old contacts with the Greek world. The possibility, however, that they took a part in the great Greek migration and remained behind on the route, and consequently spoke a Greek dialect, or a lost Indo-European language closely related to Greek, cannot be

¹⁸⁴ The unstable writing of this name has been interpreted as denoting an Indo-European labio-velar, preserved in Paeonian; cf. KRETSCHMER (1896: 247–8). BUDIMIR (1950: 27) interprets this as evidence that the Indo-European labio-velars were preserved in Pelastic, to which, according to his view, Paeonian, too, belonged.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. BELOCH (1913: 56–60), SVORONOS (1919), MERKER (1965).

¹⁸⁶ Cf. KRETSCHMER (1896: 246–9), TOMASCHEK (1893: 21), KACAROV (1922: 23), JOKL (1926: 38, 45), KRAHE (1925, 1929, 1955), MAYER (1957).

¹⁸⁷ Cf. DEČEV (1957).

¹⁸⁸ Cf. GEORGIEV (1961: 31–2; 1966a: 196–7).

¹⁸⁹ Cf. VULIĆ (1926).

wholly ruled out. They had no part in Hellenic culture nor in the Hellenic name and the Hellenes regarded them as northern barbarians. In Paeonia, too, the northern border zone of the Greek world remains in a historical twilight in which the ethnic and linguistic situation cannot be clearly discerned.

3.3 EPIRUS

To the west of Macedonia, from the Pindus range to the sea shore between the Ambracian gulf and the Acroceraunian promontory extends the country that in the most ancient times usually was referred to simply as the mainland (*ἡπειρος*), as opposed to the western islands of the Ionian Sea.¹⁹⁰ The region is rugged and mountainous, difficult to cross, but in the valleys it is fertile and rich. In the early centuries its inhabitants lived in almost complete isolation on a primitive cultural level. They were organized into tribes, and tribal variety was an outstanding feature of the country till Roman times. Strabo refers to this people as to the Epirotic tribes, and Theopompus says that they were fourteen.¹⁹¹ We can positively retrieve the names only of eleven: Χάονες, Θεσπρωτοί, Κασσωπαῖοι, Ἀμφίλοχοι, Μολοττοί, Ἀθαμᾶνες, Αἰθίκες, Τυμπαῖοι, Ὀρέσται, Παρωραῖοι, Ἀτιντᾶνες.

These tribes were not regarded as Hellenes. The classical writers are very explicit in calling them barbarians.¹⁹² Only the inhabitants

¹⁹⁰ Cf. Thucydides 1.47, speaking about the defence of Cercyra: *ἦσαν δὲ καὶ τοῖς Κορινθίοις ἐν τῇ ἡπείρῳ πολλοὶ τῶν βαρβάρων παραβεβηθηκότες· οἱ γὰρ τοῦτην ἡπειρῶται αἰεὶ ποτε φίλοι αὐτοῖς εἰσιν.*— The mainland and its dwellers are here opposed to the island of Cercyra and retain their original appellative meaning, but they could be also understood as names: Epirus and the Epirots.

¹⁹¹ Cf. Strabo 7.7.4: *ταύτην δὲ τὴν ὁδὸν ἐκ τῶν περὶ τὴν Ἐπίδαμνον καὶ τὴν Ἀπολλωνίαν τόπων ἰοῦσιν ἐν δεξιᾷ μὲν ἐστὶ τὰ Ἑπειρωτικά ἔθνη, κλυζόμενα τῷ Σικελικῷ πελάγει μέχρι τοῦ Ἀμβρακικοῦ κόλπου, ἐν ἀριστερᾷ δὲ τὰ ὄρη τὰ τῶν Ἰλλυριῶν ἃ προδιήλθομεν, καὶ τὰ ἔθνη τὰ παρικοῦντα μέχρι Μακεδονίας καὶ Παϊώνων.*— Further 7.7.5: *Τῶν μὲν οὖν Ἑπειρωτῶν ἔθνη φησὶν εἶναι Θεόπομπος τετταρεσκαίδεκα [...].*— About Epirus, cf. PHILIPPSON (1905), KAERST (1905), TREIDLER (1917), HAMMOND (1967), PAJAKOWSKI (1970).

¹⁹² Cf. Thucydides 1.47 (note 61) and 1.50: *ὁ κατὰ γῆν στρατὸς τῶν βαρβάρων προσεβεβηθήκει* as well as 2.80: *καὶ αὐτῶ παρῆσαν Ἑλλήνων μὲν Ἀμ-*

of Hellopia in the centre of Epirus around the shrine of Dodona were since ancient times recognized as Hellenes.¹⁹³ Later on, the kings of the Molossians, who ruled the whole of Epirus, claimed Hellenic descent and got it generally recognized. Pyrrhos pretended to descend from Achilles, he was a Greek sovereign, and and Epirus became integrated into the Greek world.

It was not very difficult for a monarch whose rule extended over Hellopia and Dodona to be recognized as a Hellene although his subjects were by and large reputed to be barbarians. There was an ancient tradition according to which Epirus was the cradle of the Hellenes who had from there descended to their historical lands, to Thessaly, where they lived in the time described in the Homeric poems and from where they gave their name to the Hellenic community with its specific forms of cult and culture.¹⁹⁴

The movements of population from Epirus to Thessaly have left some more traces in the traditions preserved by ancient literature. Herodotus writes that the Thessalians had come to Thessaly from

πρακιῶται καὶ Ἀνακτόριοι καὶ Λευκάδιοι καὶ οὗς αὐτὸς ἔχων ἦλθε χίλιοι Πελοποννησίων, βάρβαροι δὲ Χάονες χίλιοι ἀβασίλευτοι, ὧν ἡγοῦντο ἐπετησίῳ προστατείᾳ ἐκ τοῦ ἀρχικοῦ γένους Φώτιος καὶ Νικάνωρ. Ἐννεστρατεύοντο δὲ μετὰ Χάωνων καὶ Θεσπρωτῶν ἀβασίλευτοι. Μολοσσῶν δὲ ἦγε καὶ Ἀτιντᾶνας Σαβύλινθος ἐπίτροπος ὧν Θάρυπος τοῦ βασιλέως ἔτι παιδὸς, ὄντος, καὶ Παραναίους Ὀροῖδος βασιλεύων. Ὀρέσται δὲ χίλιοι, ὧν ἐβασίλευεν Ἀντίοχος, μετὰ Παραναίων ἔννεστρατεύοντο Ὀροῖδω Ἀντιόχῳ ἐπιτρέψαντος. ἔπεμψε δὲ καὶ Περδίκκας κρύφα τῶν Ἀθηναίων χίλιους Μακεδόνων, οἱ ὕστερον ἦλθον. — 2.68; 2.81: Χάονες καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι βάρβαροι. — 2.82: τῆς μάχης τῆς πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους [...]. — 3.112: ὑπὸ βαρβάρων Ἀμφιλόχων. — 2.68: about the Amphilochian Argos καὶ ἡλλενίσθησαν τὴν νῦν γλῶσσαν πρῶτον ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀμπρακιωτῶν ξυνοικησάντων, οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι Ἀμφίλοχοι βάρβαροί εἰσιν. — Cf. further Strabo in note 10 and 8.1.3: Ἐφορος μὲν οὖν ἀρχὴν εἶναι τῆς Ἑλλάδος τὴν Ἀκαρνανίαν φησὶν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐσπερίων μερῶν. ταύτην γὰρ συν- ἀπτειν πρῶτην τοῖς Ἑπειρωτικοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

¹⁹³ Cf. Herodotus 4.33: *πρῶτους Λαδωναίους τῶν Ἑλλήνων δέκεσθαι* cf. also above p. 20. Another Epirotic oracle, frequented by the Hellenes and quite familiar to them, was the Necromanteion on the Acheron river in the country of the Thesprotians; cf. Herodotus 5.92, η.

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Aristotle, *Meteorologica* 352 a-b: [...] *περὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τὴν Ἀρχαίαν, αὐτὴ δ' ἐστὶν ἡ περὶ Λαδώνην καὶ τὸν Ἀχελῶνα. οὗτος γὰρ πολλὰ χροῖα τὸ δρεῦμα μεταβέβληκεν* ὥκουν γὰρ οἱ Σελλοὶ ἐνταῦθα καὶ οἱ καλούμενοι τότε μὲν Γραικοὶ νῦν δ' Ἕλληνες.

Thesprotia in Epirus.¹⁹⁵ The remnants of the ancient wall, built by the Phocians to stop their invasion, were still to be seen in the time of the battle at Thermopylae. According to another tradition, the descendants of Thessalus had come to the country from Ephyra in Thesprotia and had named it after their ancestor.¹⁹⁶

In full accordance with these legendary data is the fact that in Epirus and western Thessaly there are almost no traces of the characteristic Pre-Greek toponymy. One can infer from this that the Pre-Greek linguistic substratum did not extend till there. So it is most probable that this is really the ancient Hellas, as Aristotle says, from where the Greek Indo-Europeans at some time about 1950 B.C. descended to the south and spread over the flourishing Aegean at the end of its Early Bronze Age.

This conclusion is fully supported by the etymological findings of V. Georgiev who claims that all principal geographic names of the area have Greek etymologies with a distinct archaic flavour.¹⁹⁷ Here we can give only some examples:

- Ἡπειρος cf. Gr. ἡπειρος 'mainland'
- Ἀργυρίνοι cf. Gr. ἄργυρος 'silver'
- Χάονες cf. Gr. χάος 'void', χάσκω 'yawn, gape'
- Παραυαῖοι – people living at (παρά) the river ἈΨῶς
- Θεσπρωτοί cf. Gr. πρῶτος 'first' and archaic compounds with θεός such as θεσφατος 'spoken by a god', or θέσκελος 'set in motion by a god'
- Κασσωποί 'people with brilliant eyes'; cf. Gr. κέκασμαι 'I shine' and ὤψ 'eye, face'
- Μολοσσοί cf. Gr. μαλακός 'soft'
- Ἀθαμᾶνες cf. Gr. θαμέες 'crowded'

¹⁹⁵ Herodotus 7.176: Θεσσαλοὶ ἦλθον ἐκ Θεσπρωτῶν οἰκίσσοντες γῆν τὴν Αἰολίδα, τὴν περ νῦν ἐκτέταται.

¹⁹⁶ Strabo 9.5.23: τινὲς δὲ ἀπὸ Ἐφύρας τῆς Θεσπρωτίδος ἀπογόνους Ἀντίφον καὶ Φειδίππου, τῶν Θετταλοῦ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους, ἐπελθόντας ἀπὸ Θετταλοῦ τοῦ ἐαντῶν προγόνου τὴν χώραν ὀνομάσαι. The Thessalian Perrhaebi are also known to have lived in the mountains near Dodona and in Northern Thessaly; cf. Homer, II. 2.749–52.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. GEORGIEV (1961: 15–22; 1966a: 180–7).

- Αἰθικες cf. Gr. αἶθος 'flame'
- Ἀμφίλοχοι cf. Gr. ἀμφί 'around' and λόχος 'ambush'
- Κεραύνια cf. Gr. κεραυνός 'lightening'
- Βοῖον cf. Gr. archaic -βοῖος 'belonging to oxen'
- Λάκμων cf. Gr. λακίς 'rending'
- Τομᾶρος cf. OI *tamisram* 'darkness'
- Πασσαρών cf. Gr. πασσάριος 'a cross'

Some of the Greek etymologies proposed by Georgiev for Epirotic geographic names may be disputable. But the mere fact that it is possible to find Greek explanations for almost all of these names remains highly significant. Although ancient authors regard the Epirots as barbarians, it seems that their country was fully integrated into the area of the Greek language. This is confirmed by the discovery of inscriptions from 370/368 B.C. in Dodona. The tribes represented on them are the Molossians and Thesprotians. These texts are entirely in Greek of a north-western brand, and the personal names are all Greek. The language and the names of these inscriptions were not suddenly adopted. These tribes certainly spoke Greek even before the time of Thucydides. Consequently, he called them barbarians without any connotation of non-Greek speech. They may have spoken an uncouth and peculiar form of Greek, difficult and foreign to the Hellenic ear.¹⁹⁸

This conclusion contrasts very much with the opinion of many

¹⁹⁸ HAMMOND sums up: "The conclusion is of great interest. The archaeological evidence shows that Greek culture, as revealed in pottery and other objects, did not penetrate into inland Epirus, except at Dodona and there only to a very limited extent, until the fourth century. The historical evidence in general and Thucydides' description of the tribes of inland Epirus as *bárbaroi* are in agreement with the archaeological evidence. Therefore the idea that Greek speech spread from the Greek cities on the coast and superseded an indigenous non-Greek language during the fifth or the sixth centuries cannot be seriously entertained. Central Illyria was geographically much more open to penetration from Epidamnus, Apollonia, and Byllia, but Greek speech did not supersede Illyrian speech there in the fourth century or later. The conclusion is, I think, unavoidable that a form of Greek was spoken by the Molossians and the Thesprotians and probably by some other tribes throughout the Dark Age." (HAMMOND 1967: 423)

linguists and historians, according to which the Epirotic tribes spoke a non-Greek language and were linguistically connected with the Illyrian area north of the Acroceraunian promontory.¹⁹⁹ Kretschmer stresses some onomastic analogies with the north-western area. Such analogies form a very weak basis for conclusions about linguistic affiliations, particularly when considering Georgiev's Greek etymologies.

More important are the linguistic data adduced by Nilsson. Among the Epirotic chieftains mentioned by Thucydides²⁰⁰ Ὀροίδης the Paravaean, Σαβύλινθος and Θάρυψ the Molossians, and Φώτιος the Chaonian (if it is not to be read Φώτιος) seem to have non-Greek names. Only Νικάνωρ the Chaonian and Ἀντίοχος the Orestian bear distinctly Greek names.²⁰¹ Although small in number, these names are highly significant since they give us a fragment of ancient anthroponymy as it was current among prominent Epirots.

Such as it stands, this short list gives much weight to the opinion that the Epirotic tribes were barbarians in the linguistic as well as in the cultural sense. Yet, the inscriptions of Dodona, going back as far as the beginning of the 4th century B.C., show beyond any doubt that the personal names in at least two of the major tribes, the Thesprotians and the Molossians, were Greek to the core. Nilsson's list cannot invalidate the conclusiveness of that evidence. The data now at our disposal seem to confirm the intuition of those scholars who from the very outset tended to believe that the Epirotic tribes spoke some sort of north-western Greek dialect.²⁰²

If the Epirotic tribes really belong to the rear-guard of the Dorian invasion, it becomes clear why the tribe of the Orestians is in some sources mentioned as Epirotic, in others as belonging to upper

¹⁹⁹ Cf. HAHN (1854: 215–), KRETSCHMER (1896: 254–8), NILSSON (1909: 1–16).

²⁰⁰ Thucydides 2.80 (cf. note 192).

²⁰¹ Cf. NILSSON (1909: 7).

²⁰² Cf. FICK (1879), SCHMIDT (1894), BELOCH (1897, 1913), and within the framework of a complex cultural and historical interpretation LEPORE (1962). About the dialect of the inscriptions from Dodona, cf. SALONIUS (1911, 1915), THUMB – KIECKERS (1932: 312–5).

Macedonia. This reflects, no doubt, the changing influences and overlordship in the high valleys of the Pindus range. But it is much easier to understand if all these tribes belong to the complex of the ἔθνος Μακεδόνων which lived, according to Herodotus, in that mountain area.

Strabo tells us that in hair-cut, speech, and clothing the Epirots were like the Macedonians.²⁰³ Thus the circle seems to be closed. Yet, in the same sentence he adds that some were bilingual. This suggests the admixture of an alloglottic element in Epirus which remained hidden under the surface of Greek literacy as displayed in the epigraphic records. In this connection, the non-Greek names of Epirotic chieftains mentioned by Thucydides become even more significant. The more so, as Strabo speaks about the Epirotic barbarians in a way which can only with difficulty be interpreted as referring not to the language, but only to the primitive culture and the archaic way of life.²⁰⁴

Taking into consideration everything we know at present, we cannot possibly believe with Kretschmer and other scholars that Epirus was in classical antiquity an Illyrian country with only a small Greek enclave at Dodona. The Greek ethnic and linguistic basis there was much broader. But the possibility must be reckoned with that some tribes or parts of tribes were non-Greek and that the immigration from the northern linguistic area, which can be traced through the whole history of Epirus, had begun already at the dawn of recorded history, during the Dorian invasion of Greece, when large numbers of speakers of Greek left the northern highland and went to peninsular Greece.²⁰⁵

²⁰³ Cf. Strabo 7.7.8: ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ σύμπασαν τὴν μέχρι Κορκύρας Μακεδονίαν προσαγορεύουσιν, αἰτιολογούντες ἅμα ὅτι καὶ κοινὰ καὶ διαλέκτῳ καὶ γλαμῶδι καὶ ἄλλοις τοιούτοις χρώνται παραπλησίως. ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ δίγλωττοι εἰσι.

²⁰⁴ Cf. Strabo 7.7.1 on p. 17. above; cf. also note 10.

²⁰⁵ Cf. HAMMOND (1967: 424): "During the Late Bronze Age these same tribes must have been further north than they were in the classical period; for their classical habitat was then occupied by the Doric-speaking and the North-west-Greek-speaking peoples, who moved out during the so-called Dorian invasion. We can thus see that there was in the Late Bronze Age a reservoir of Greek-speaking peoples in the area of what is now Southern Albania and South-easternmost Yugoslavia."

The slopes of the Pindus, in the broadest sense, are the homeland of the Greek language; from there it spread to the Hellas of later days. But in the highlands remained the rear-guard of the waves of Greek migration. It did not take part in the development of Hellenic culture and thus remained outside the Hellenic world. And when at last this rear-guard made its appearance in Hellenic history, it was viewed as the Macedonian and Epirotic barbarians. It seems that in the classical period the Greek linguistic area extended much further to the north than the full development of Hellenic culture could ever reach. On the eve of Hellenism it was imported there as if in foreign countries, which culturally, if not linguistically, indeed they were.

But when the repeated southward movements left behind them a population weaker in number than the original one, some non-Greek groups may have come to Epirus and entered its tribal organization. Their traces may be recognizable in the non-Greek names of leading Epirots and in the recorded bilingualism of the country. Epirus could then be mentioned as an example of a country with a non-Greek population on the border of the Greek world. It is Strabo who mentions it in that way.

All this is of course no more than a possibility which obliges us, even in the face of the strong evidence which supports the inclusion of ancient Epirus into the Greek linguistic area, to have an open mind for all indications that may perhaps testify to the admixture of a non-Greek language. The question of non-Greek languages in ancient Epirus should not be closed altogether since the true situation may be much more complex than the advocates of "pure Hellenism" like to admit. We know that on the territory of the Macedonian kingdom various non-Greek languages were spoken, especially Thracian and, probably, Paeonian. There are reasons to suspect that, under different historical conditions, something similar may have happened with the Epirotic tribes too.

At present, we cannot say more. Aside from new discoveries, only a deeper analysis of the Greek language on the Epirotic inscriptions and of the names of Epirotic tribesmen may lead to substantial progress in the field; only in such a way can it be shown

how much of the native Grecity we can detect in the historical records.

Finally, an interesting observation should be stressed. The meagre results of linguistic investigations in the border zone tend to suggest that to the ancient Greeks, if there was no strong cultural affinity, genetic relationship meant little for the feeling of linguistic identity. Greek, or closely cognate, speech was quite naturally qualified as barbarian and consequently as foreign when it was not integrated into the complex of Hellenic culture. This shows the importance of cultural factors in determining linguistic identities.

4 THE THRACIAN COMPLEX

4.1 GEOGRAPHIC AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

To the north-east of the Aegean area extended in antiquity the country of the Thracians. They were known to the Greeks since the most remote past and for all their tribal diversity there was never a doubt as to their fundamental ethnic and linguistic unity.²⁰⁶ Their geographic location is given already by Homer²⁰⁷ and to later literary tradition they were the northern people of the continental block, a people of large numbers. Dionysius Periegetes expresses this attitude by describing the Thracians as holders of boundless land.²⁰⁸ Herodotus believes them to be the most numerous people on earth after the Indians,²⁰⁹ and Pausanias writes that they were inferior in number only to the Celts, reducing thus the comparison

²⁰⁶ How early the Greeks made the acquaintance of the Thracians is shown by the dialectal variety of the form of their name in Greek: in Homeric poetry the most ancient Ionian form *Θρηῖκες* is current, alternating with *Θρηῖες*. The Attic form is *Θρᾶκες*, feminine *Θρᾶττα/Θρᾶσσα*. The form *Θρέικες* is also attested. The country is called *Θρήκη* or *Θράκη*. The Thracians were famous as horsemen and for the mountains of their country that were mostly covered with snow (Il. 14,227–8: *σεύατ' ἐφ' ἱπποπόλων Θρηκῶν ὄρεα νιφέντα, ἀκροτάτας κορυφάς*. [...]).

²⁰⁷ Cf. Il. 2.844–5: *αὐτὰρ Θρηῖκας ἦγ' Ἀκάμας καὶ Πείροος ἦρωες, ὅσσους Ἑλλήσποντος ἀγάρροος ἐντὸς ἐέργει*.

²⁰⁸ Dionysius Periegetes 332: *Θρηῖκες ἀπείρονα γαῖαν ἔχοντες*.

²⁰⁹ Herodotus 5.3: *Θρηκῶν δὲ ἔθνος μέγιστόν ἐστι μετὰ γε Ἰνδοῦς πάντων ἀνθρώπων*.

to Europe and having the fuller information of a later time.²¹⁰ More detailed geographic knowledge corrected afterwards the picture of an endless northern space, and the Danube was soon recognized as the northern boundary of Thrace.²¹¹ The central area of Thrace was even more restricted. Already Hecataeus had designed the range of the Haemus, mount Balkan of today, as the end of Thrace proper.²¹² In the west, the Axios river seems to have been the original border of the Thracian territory. Macedonian expansion moved it to the Strymon, and the political border was finally established on the Nestos, but this had no ethnic and linguistic consequences. Greek colonization expanded over almost the whole of the sea coast and thus reduced the Thracian ethnic element to the interior. This final delimitation of Thrace proper is accurately described by Strabo.²¹³

The testimony of ancient authors about the existence of Thracian groups in Greece seems to be quite trustworthy. Some traces of religious and cultural influence can be detected even in the most ancient Greek world.²¹⁴ Thracian groups seem to have settled in central Greece.²¹⁵ The cults of Ares and Dionysos were of Thracian origin. The names of these gods appear already in the Mycenaean texts and thus show how old the Thracian influence on Greek spiritual life was. The mythical complexes of Orpheus, Thamyras,

²¹⁰ Pausanias 1.9.5: *Θρακῶν δὲ τῶν πάντων οὐδένας πλείους εἰσι τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὅτι μὴ Κελτοὶ πρὸς ἄλλο ἔθνος ἐν ἀντεξετάζοντι [...]*.

²¹¹ Cf. Herodotus 5.8–9: *ταφαὶ μὲν δὴ Θρηκῶν εἰσι αἶδε. τὸ δὲ πρὸς βορέω ἐτι τῆς χώρας ταύτης οὐδεὶς ἔχει φράσαι τὸ ἀτρεκές, οὔτινές εἰσι ἀνθρώποι οἰκούντες αὐτήν, ἀλλὰ τὰ πέριγ' ἡδὴ Ἰστρου ἐρημος χώρα φαίνεται εὐεσσα καὶ ἀπειρος*.

²¹² Cf. JACOBY (1912: 2715).

²¹³ Strabo 7.7.4: *ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν Μακεδονικῶν ὁρῶν καὶ τῶν Παιονικῶν μέχρι Στρυμόνος ποταμοῦ Μακεδόνες τε οἰκοῦσι καὶ Παῖονες καὶ τινες τῶν ὀρεινῶν Θρακῶν τὰ δὲ πέραν Στρυμόνος ἡδὴ μέχρι τοῦ Ποντικοῦ στόματος καὶ τοῦ Αἰμου πάντα Θρακῶν ἐστὶ πλὴν τῆς παραλίας· αὐτὴ δ' ὅφ' Ἑλλήνων οἰκεῖται, τῶν μὲν ἐπὶ τῇ Προποντίδι ἰδρυμένων, τῶν δὲ ἐφ' Ἑλλησπόντῳ καὶ τῷ Μέλανι κόλπῳ τῶν δ' ἐπὶ τῷ Αἰγαίῳ*.

²¹⁴ Cf. WIESNER (1963: 19).

²¹⁵ Cf. Strabo 7.7.1; text above, p. 17 and footnote 10. Cf. also Thucydides 2.29; Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 563; Strabo 9.3.14; Pausanias 1.41.8.

and Eumolpus testify to the same historical connections. In classical times, relations between Athens and Thrace were especially close.

There are traces of a Thracian presence on the shores of the Adriatic. The Histri in Istria were described as a Thracian tribe.²¹⁶ It is possible that this is a confusion caused by homonymy with the ancient Greek denomination of the Danube ("Ιστρος). Indications of the presence of Phrygians on the Adriatic are to be taken more serious: under the western variant form of their name (Βρύγες), they appear in the surroundings of Epidamnus/Dyrrachium.²¹⁷ In hellenistic poetry they are connected with the islands of the northern Adriatic.²¹⁸ This seems to be only a literary construction. More important were the Brygian groups in Macedonia. Herodotus mentions them on the Thermaic gulf,²¹⁹ Strabo on the river Erigon,²²⁰ Pseudo-Scymnus near Lake Lychnitis.²²¹ Whatever the Phrygians were, ethnically and linguistically, they enter the Thracian complex in some way or other: while the majority of the people had crossed over the Straits to Asia Minor in the big Aegean migration about 1100 B.C. and played a part in the destruction of the Hittite empire, some smaller groups, called *Brygians*, were left behind on the Balkans.²²²

To the north of mount Haemus, on the banks of the Danube, lived peoples whom the ancients included among the Thracians in a broader sense, but who appear more often under their own ethnic names, their individuality being thus strongly stressed. Among them the Mysians were known since the most ancient times; they were mentioned already by Homer who describes Zeus

²¹⁶ Cf. Apollodorus frgm. 119; Pseudo-Scymnus 390.

²¹⁷ Cf. Strabo 7.7.8; Appianus, Bellum civile 2.39. In the cyclic epic Telegonia they are introduced as fighting Odysseus and the Epirotic Thesprotians. Cf. Proclus 5.

²¹⁸ Cf. Apollonius Rhodius 4.330 and 470 with the scholia.

²¹⁹ Cf. Herodotus 4.45.

²²⁰ Cf. Strabo 7.7.9.

²²¹ Cf. Pseudo-Scymnus 434 and 437.

²²² Cf. Herodotus 7.73: οἱ δὲ Φρύγες, ὡς Μακεδόνες λέγουσι, ἐκαλέοντο Βρίγες χρόνον ὅσον Εὐρωπήνιοι ἐόντες σύνοικοι ἦσαν Μακεδόσι, μεταβάντες δὲ ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην ἅμα τῇ χώρῃ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα μετέβαλον – Cf. also KRETSCHMER (1896: 172–), WIESNER (1963: 58–).

turning his eyes from the Trojan battle field to the country of the Thracian horsemen, the Mysians who fight hand to hand, the noble milk-fed mare-milkers and the Abians, most observant of duty.²²³

The ancient scholars were not quite sure whether the Poet speaks of the Danubian Mysians, which were known also as Moesians, or of the Mysians who in historical times inhabited a part of north-western Anatolia in the neighbourhood of the Troas. Like the Phrygians these Mysians had come from the Thracian Balkans. Another people of the Thracian group were the Getae who lived on both banks of the lower Danube and were also considered to be Thracians.²²⁴

A western group of the Getae, inhabiting the region of the south-eastern Carpathians, were called the Dacians. They spoke the same

²²³ Cf. Il. 13.1–7:

Ζεὺς δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν Τρῳάς τε καὶ Ἑκτορα νηυσὶ πέλασσαν,
τοὺς μὲν ἔα παρὰ τῇσι πόνον τ' ἐχέμεν καὶ δίζην
νωλεμέως, αὐτὸς δὲ πάλιν τρέπεν ὅσσε φαινώ,
νόσφιν ἔφ' ἱπποπόλων Ὀρηκῶν καθορώμενος αἶαν
Μυσῶν τ' ἀγχεμάχων καὶ ἀγανῶν Ἰππημολγῶν
γλακτοφάγων, Ἀβίων τε, δικαιοτάτων ἀνθρώπων.
ἐς Τροίην δ' οὐ πάμπαν ἔτι τρέπεν ὅσσε φαινώ.

²²⁴ Cf. Strabo 7.3.2: Οἱ τοίνυν Ἕλληνες τοὺς Γέτας Θρᾷκας ὑπελάμβανον ὥκων δ' ἐφ' ἐκάτερα τοῦ Ἰστροῦ καὶ οὗτοι καὶ οἱ Μυσοὶ Θρᾷκες ὄντες καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ οὗς νῦν Μοισοὺς καλοῦσιν, ἀφ' ὧν ὠρμήθησαν καὶ οἱ νῦν μεταξὺ Λυδῶν καὶ Φρυγῶν καὶ Τρώων οἰκοῦντες Μυσοί. καὶ αὐτοὶ δ' οἱ Φρύγες Βρίγες εἰσὶ, Θρᾷκόν τι ἔθνος, καθάπερ καὶ Μυγδόνες καὶ Βέρβρυκες καὶ Μαιδοβιθυννοὶ καὶ Βιθυννοὶ καὶ Θυνοὶ, δοκῶ δὲ καὶ τοὺς Μαριανδυνούς. οὗτοι μὲν τελέως ἐκλελοίπασιν πάντες τὴν Εὐρώπην, οἱ δὲ Μυσοὶ συνέμειναν. – Also Strabo 12.3.3; 8.1; Eustathius ad Dionysium Periegetam 322; Constantinus Porphyrogenitus, De thematibus 1.3; Plinius, Nat. hist. 5.145; Iulius Solinus 40.20. – There was in Antiquity also a contradictory historical tradition according to which the Mysians were an Anatolian people, descended from Lydian colonists and cognate with the Lydians and Carians; cf. Herodotus 7.74: οὗτοι (i.e. Μυσοί) δὲ εἰσι Λυδῶν ἀποικοί; – 1.171: ἀποδεικνύσι δὲ ἐν Μυλάσσοις Λιδὸς Καρίου ἱδὸν ἀρχαῖον, τοῦ Μυσοῖσι μὲν καὶ Λυδοῖσι μέτεστι ὡς κασιγνήτοισι οὖσι τοῖσι Καρίσι; τὸν γὰρ Λυδὸν καὶ τὸν Μυσὸν λέγουσι εἶναι Καρὸς ἀδελφεούς; – 7.8.3: [...] ὅτι τοὺς Μυσοὺς οἱ μὲν Θρᾷκας οἱ δὲ Λυδοὺς εἰρήκασιν, κατ' αἰτίαν παλαιῶν ἱστοροῦντες ἦν Σάνθος ὁ Λυδὸς γράφει καὶ Μενεκράτης ὁ Ἐλαττης [...]. – Probably acculturation is here wrongly interpreted as cognation. In harmony with the tradition about the Anatolian autochthony of the Mysians is the tradition about a Mysian invasion of the Balkans; cf. Herodotus 7.20; Dionysius Byzantinus, Anaplus, p. 23.3–8.

language as the Getae and thus belonged also to the Thracian complex.²²⁵ The Getae shared their language with the Thracians.²²⁶ One can thus contend on the authority of ancient writers that the Thracian linguistic area extended not only over the northern border of Thrace proper, but even over the Danube, although this river was universally recognized as the geographic boundary of Thrace in the wider sense.

In the north-west, in the valley of the lower Morava and in the valleys of their tributaries, was the country of the Triballi, an important and powerful ethnic group, which appears usually under its own name without further qualification, but sometimes it is said to be Thracian.²²⁷

Archaeological research makes it possible to give an outline of the historical development of the Thracian area since oldest times. In the Neolithic Age, it was divided into two principal cultural zones, called after their most characteristic sites. One is Starčevo in the west, the other Boian in the east. Starčevo has manifest connections with Pre-Greek Sesklo in the south, Boian presents many features that link it to Anatolia.

At the end of the Stone Age (second half of the third millennium B.C.), the picture becomes more differentiated. From Macedonia and from Anatolia, over the Straits, radiates the influence of the Aegean and Anatolian Bronze Age. Further inland, three cultural types of the younger Neolithic can be distinguished, all called after

²²⁵ Cf. Strabo 7.3.12: *τοὺς μὲν γὰρ Δακοὺς προσαγορεύουσι τοὺς δὲ Γέτας μὲν τοὺς πρὸς τὸν Πόντον κεκλιμένους καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἕω, Δακοὺς δὲ τοὺς εἰς τ' ἀναντία πρὸς τὴν Γερμανίαν καὶ τὰς τοῦ Ἰστροῦ πηγὰς, οὗς οἶμαι Δάους καλεῖσθαι τὸ παλαιόν; 13 ὁμόγλωττοι δ' εἰσὶν οἱ Δακοὶ τοῖς Γέταις.*

²²⁶ Cf. Strabo 7.3.10: [...] *παρὰ τῶν Γετῶν, ὁμογλώττου τοῖς Θραξίν ἔθνοισιν* [...] – Menander in a comedy also introduces a Gete saying *πάντες μὲν οἱ Θραῖκες, μάλιστα δὲ οἱ Γέται ἡμεῖς* [...] – cf. Strabo 7.3.4.

²²⁷ Cf. Herodotus 4.49; Thucydides 2.96; Strabo 6.3.13: [...] *τὸ τῶν Τριβαλλῶν ἔθνος Θρακικὸν ὄν.* [...]; 7.5.6: [...] *Θρακῶν δὲ Τριβαλλοὶ* [...]. These direct testimonies have more weight than those of Stephanus Byzantinus (s.v.) who calls them an Illyrian people and of Appian Illyrica 2 who includes their eponym into an Illyrian genealogy. Stephanus and Appian are probably under the influence of the system of Roman administration and refer to the 'Illyrian provinces'; cf. Appian, Illyrica 6.

characteristic sites: Gumelnița in the east, on the lower Danube and south of it, Salcuța in the west, where today Bulgaria borders on Yugoslavia, and on the opposite bank of the Danube. In between was the area of the Vadastra culture, also on both banks. Further to the west there were two late Neolithic cultures: Bubanj in the valley of the Morava, and Vinča at its confluence with the Danube. Outside the Thracian area and adjacent to it were the big cultural zones of Erösöd-Cucuteni-Tripolje in the north as far as the Dniestr and the Dniepr, and Butmir in the west all the way to the Adriatic.

This considerable variety of cultural types is the result of a crossing and breaking of influences that came from Anatolia and the Aegean area on the one hand and from Central Europe on the other. The end of the Neolithic and the beginning of the Bronze Age soon after 2000 B.C. was characterized by a gradual disintegration of the Erösöd-Cucuteni-Tripolje culture in connection with a progression of new peoples along the sea-shore. In late Erösöd-Cucuteni-Tripolje the first traces of horsemanship in this part of the world can be found. This is of special interest here since the Thracians were from most ancient times famous as horsemen. The cultural type coming from the north-east and progressing along the Black sea to the Thracian lands is characterized by battle-axes, pottery ornamented with strings (*Schnurkeramik*), graves strewn with ochre, and horsemanship. Similar cultural elements are connected with the invasion of Greece by Greek-speaking tribes at the beginning of the Aegean Middle Bronze Age. It has therefore been assumed that the immigration of Indo-European Thracians into Thrace was a part of the same general movement and took place somewhere about 2000 B.C.

Thus, if the Neolithic cultures of Thrace were Pre-Thracian, the Bronze Age is generally believed to have been already Thracian. There are, however, some archaeologists and linguists who believe that the Thracian stratum is autochthonous in Thrace. In fact, it is not easy to say whether there was a Pre-Thracian substratum in Thrace since we do not know enough about the language; yet on the whole it is very probable.

The Thracian Bronze Age is in its general outlines an extension and an intensification of Aegean and Anatolian influences with a strong admixture of the north-eastern cultural type of the battle-axes and the ochre-graves.

After a long respite of peaceful development, which led to a flowering of Bronze Age culture in the 16th century B.C. and continued till the 13th, a new period of migrations and big population shifts began. It is generally known as the Aegean Migration. It was a huge movement that upset the whole Balkans, entered deep into Asia Minor, and reached Palestine and the shores of Egypt. No details are known. In the course of this migration the Mysians and the Phrygians came to their historical homelands, the Philistines appeared in the Middle East, and the Peoples of the Sea threatened Egypt. In the same wave of migrations, the Mycenaean culture in Greece came to an end, and the Dorian and North-Eastern Greeks reached their historical habitat.

The Thracian ethnic and linguistic situation of classical times resulted thus basically from the Aegean Migration. In the eighth and seventh centuries B.C., a new major movement of populations took place. The main motors of this shift were the Scythians and the Cimmerians. Tribes from Thrace proper, Thracians in the narrowest sense of the word, were then pushed over the Straits from the Balkans to Asia Minor. In its extreme north-west thus settled the Βιθυνοί, the Τρῆρες, and the Τραλλεῖς, all Thracian tribes of quite the same type as those on the Balkans.

On the other side of the Straits was the country of the Θυνοί. On their shore the Megarians founded their colony of Byzantium. The Thracian Chersonnesus (the Peninsula of Gallipoli of today) was inhabited by the Δόλογχοι. The shore to the west of this peninsula was held by the Ἀψινθιοί. The Παῦτοι settled at the mouth of the Hebrus and from there westward, the Βέννοι further up the river. Further west on the shore of the Aegean lived the Κίχονες, famous already to Homer for their wine, and the Σάιοι, mentioned by Archilochus as the warlike inhabitants of the coast opposite Thasos. In historical times, the Πίερες settled on the sea-shore east of the Strymon after they were expelled from southernmost Mace-

donia. At the Pangaios mountain, more inland, lived the Ἡδῶνες, and more inland still, on the Strymon, the closely related Ὀδόμαντες. Mainly on the western bank of the Strymon appear the Βισάλλται, interior above Chalcidice the Κρηστῶνες, and the Μυγδόνες and Σίθωνες on the peninsula itself. The islands of the northern Aegean originally also had a Thracian population. There are traces of Edonians on Thasos and of Saians on Samothrace. On Lemnos lived the Thracian Σίντιες. Mythological traces of a Thracian population are the sons of Boreas, the Thracian wind, on Naxos, Imbros, and Cos.

North of this coastal fringe lived the Thracian hill tribes. In the central mountains of the Rhodope, the Thracian hills covered with snow,²²⁸ settled four tribes (the Βησσοί, the Σάτραι, the Δῖοι, and the Διόβησσοι). They formed some sort of tribal confederation (τετραχωρῖται) and were famous for their oracle of Dionysos. They expanded their territory and conquered their southern neighbours.

To the west of the central hill tribes, in the upper valley of the Strymon, lived the Μαυδοί, and north of them, on the springs of the river, the Δανθαλήται. In the east, between the central tribes and the shore of the Black Sea was the country of the Ὀδρύσαι. This was the most powerful tribe in Thrace, which had founded a kingdom that for a time in the 5th century B.C. ruled directly or indirectly almost the whole of the country. Their kings were allies of Athens. Even the cult of the Thracian Artemis Bendis was officially introduced there.

Still further north, on the border of Thrace proper, settled the Τραυσοί, the Τρῆρες (who remained there when part of their people left for Asia Minor), and the Σέρδαι in the extreme west (in the valley of Sofia whose ancient name was *Serdica*); furthermore the Ἀρτάκιοι in the Haemus, and the Κερβήνιοι on the uppermost Hebrus.

Of the tribes outside Thrace proper the Triballi, the Mysians, the Getae, and the Dacians have already been mentioned and their habitats sketched. An important tribe on the Marisus river in the Banat of today were the Ἀγάθυρσοι.

²²⁸ Cf. Homer, Il. 14.227-8.

All this tribal variety can on the authority of the ancient sources be regarded as the ethnic and linguistic complex of which the Thracian people was composed. In spite of their failure ever to become an outstanding political or cultural factor in the ancient world, the Thracians were important for their horsemanship, their inspiring lore that commanded the respect of the highly cultivated Greeks and Romans, for the vitality their blood gave to the ancient world, and, above all, for the deep spiritual influence they exercised on the Greeks at the very beginning of their history.

Although the Thracians were exposed to an all-pervasive hellenization and romanization, which in late antiquity led to an almost complete extinction of their language, in some regions at least Thracian was spoken till the immigration of a Slavic population in the early Middle Ages. The language of the Bessi is mentioned as being in ecclesiastic use as late as the 6th century A.D.²²⁹

It can be shown on the basis of toponomastic material that the Slavs came in direct contact with Thracians who still spoke their language; cf. Bulg. *Plovdiv* from Thracian *Pulpudeva* and not from Greek Φιλίππουπολις.

These introductory notes on the geographical and historical background of the Thracian complex are necessary for a full understanding of its linguistic aspects.²³⁰

²²⁹ Cf. Symeon Metaphrastes, Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 114, p. 505c: the monk Theodosius (529) built on the eastern bank of the Jordan a monastery and in it four holy buildings: ἐν δὲ δευτέρῳ δὲ τὸ τῶν Βεσσῶν γένος τῇ σφετέρᾳ φωνῇ τῷ κοινῷ Δεσπότη τὰς εὐχὰς ἀπεδίδου [...]. – Antoninus of Placentia, *Itinerarium* (ed. Gildemeister) c. 37, found in a monastery at the foot of the Sinai: *tres abbates, scientes linguas, hoc est Latinam, Bessam et Graecam, Syriacam et Aegyptiacam*. There are scholars who believe that this language of the Bessi was not Thracian but Abyssinian or Iberian (Georgian), or vulgar Latin from Thrace; cf. RUSSU (1969a: 194–5).

²³⁰ About Thrace, the Thracians, the Dacians, the Phrygians, and the Mysians, cf. TOMASCHEK (1893), KRETSCHMER (1896: 171–243), OBERHUMMER (1936), LENK (1936), BETZ (1936), KACAROV (1936), WIESNER (1963), PAPAZOGLU (1969), BRANDIS (1901), RUGE (1941), FRIEDRICH (1941), OBERHUMMER (1897), JOKL (1927–28), WERNER (1969).

4.2 THE LANGUAGE

Our knowledge of the Thracian language is not proportionate to the numbers of its speakers and to its importance in the ancient world. It has almost completely disappeared, as the language of the Gauls and of so many Germanic tribes also did, because it always remained outside the sphere of ancient culture and literature. We happen to know that Ovidius during his exile in Tomi wrote poetry in the Getic dialect.²³¹ Unfortunately, nothing of it is preserved and the whole experiment remained quite exceptional. No Thracian literacy was ever developed, although the Greek, and presumably also the Latin, alphabet was sometimes used in a crude and awkward way. Two Thracian inscriptions in Greek characters have survived. One is engraved on the plate of a golden ring found in a grave mound close to the Bulgarian village of Ezerovo near Plovdiv. The inscription is from the fifth century B.C. and consists of nine short lines written *in continuo*. It is impossible to delimit the words in any non-arbitrary way. The many attempts at an interpretation have therefore remained only tentative and no consensus among scholars has been achieved.²³²

The other inscription was also found in Bulgaria: in 1965, near the village of Kjolmen in the district of Preslav. It is engraved on a massive tombstone. It dates from the sixth century B.C., is written in Greek characters and some words are separated by dots. It consists of three short lines. A tentative interpretation has been given by Georgiev.²³³

These original texts, although precious, are much too scant and their interpretation not sure enough to be of any real value for the

²³¹ Cf. Ex Ponto 4.13.19–20: *Getico scripsi sermone libellum structaque sunt nostris barbara verba modis*.

²³² A full survey and a discussion of the attempts of FILOV, PÄRVAN, KRETSCHMER, DEČEV, HIRT, OLSEN, RIBEZZO, SEURE, BASANAVIČIUS, SRBA, APOSTOLIDES, PISANI, BLUMENTHAL, KOŘINEK, VAN GINNEKEN and GEORGIEV is given by DEČEV (1957: 266–82).

²³³ Cf. GEORGIEV (1966b). Other texts that GEORGIEV believes to be Thracian cannot be really interpreted in that way; cf. GEORGIEV (1957b: 5–53; 1966a: 130–2).

study of Thracian. One has therefore to resort to other sources, such as glosses and proper names, which, although of a much less satisfactory nature give the only dependable information on the Thracian language we can for the time being utilize. It goes without saying that under the prevailing circumstances our knowledge of the Thracian language remains fragmentary and tentative.

As early as the 19th century, the Thracian language attracted the attention of such Indo-Europeanists and Orientalists as Grimm, Leo, de Lagarde, Roesler, and Fick.²³⁴ The real basis of modern scholarship in this field was laid by W. Tomaschek in his fundamental monograph.²³⁵ Other specialists in this branch of learning developed it further.²³⁶ We have now at our disposal an imposing number of syntheses in which the results of research are systematically presented and easily accessible. Tomaschek's work has now been fully replaced by a complete collection of Thracian linguistic data²³⁷, and five sketches of a comparative grammar of Thracian have been written.²³⁸ Thracian has thus become a field of easy access to students of linguistics, and even to those of history and archaeology. Here we shall concentrate only on the main problems.

For the study of Thracian we have at our disposal about sixty glosses, a fairly high number, which makes an etymological approach possible. It can therefore be shown with a high probability that Thracian was an Indo-European language. This can be illustrated here only with some representative etymologies:²³⁹

βόλινθος 'European bison': IE **bhl-ent-/bhl-ēn-*; cf. OE *bula* 'bull'

²³⁴ Cf. RUSSU (1969a: 63–5).

²³⁵ Cf. TOMASCHÉK (1893–94) RUSSU (1969a: 65–7) quotes also his other papers.

²³⁶ About the contributions of G. MEYER, KRETSCHMER, HIRT, DEČEV, MLADENOV, SEURE, MATEESCU, PÂRVAN, SCHRADER and RUSSU, with a critical discussion, cf. RUSSU (1969a: 67–82).

²³⁷ Cf. DEČEV (1957) and VLAHOV (1964).

²³⁸ Cf. JOKL (1929), BRANDENSTEIN (1936), DEČEV (1952, 1960), GEORGIEV (1957, 1966a), RUSSU (1959, 1964, 1969a).

²³⁹ For the etymological material, cf. the works mentioned in the preceding note.

βρία IE **wriyā*; cf. Toch. A *ri*; Toch. B *riye* 'town'
 βρίζα 'rye': IE **wriġh-*; cf. OI *vr̥his* 'rice' or IE **breġh-*; cf. Norw. *brok* 'a kind of grass'
 βρίλων 'barber': IE **bhri-l-*; cf. OCS *briti* 'shave'
 βρυγχός 'guitarre': IE **bhrmkos*; cf. OCS *brękati* 'make a noise', Pol. *brzęk* 'noise', Gr. Eol. φόρμυγξ
 βρῦτος 'beer': IE **bhrūto-*; cf. OE *broð* 'soup', Lat. *de-frūtum* 'cooked grape juice'
 γέντον 'meat': IE **g^hento-* 'struck, cut'; cf. OI *hantvas* 'who is to be struck', *hantar* 'killer', OCS *žetva* 'harvest', *žeteljъ* 'harvester'
gestistyrum 'locus possessorum': IE **ghendti-sturo-*; cf. Alb. *gjet* 'get', Lat. *pre-hendo* 'take', and Lith. *stovà* 'post'
 ζαλμός 'skin': IE **kelm-/kolm-*; cf. OI *šarman* 'protection', Goth. *hilms* 'helmet'
 ζετραία 'pipkin': IE **gheutr-*; cf. Gr. χύτρα 'pipkin'
 ζήλας, ζελας, ζειλά, ζίλαι 'wine'; IE **ghēlo-*; cf. OI *hālā* 'brandy', Gr. χάλις 'pure wine'
 μανδάκης 'band to tie trusses': IE **bhondhoko-*; cf. OI *bandhakas* 'binder'
 σάλημη 'knife, sword': IE **skolmā*; cf. ON *skolm* 'prong'

The conclusion that Thracian is an Indo-European language is confirmed by the etymological analysis of personal and other names. Not only are the Thracian personal names very often compounds of the type well known in the anthroponymy of Indo-Iranian, Greek, Slavic, Germanic, and Celtic, but some of the Thracian lexical elements invite on Indo-European etymologization in a way which cannot easily be regarded as fortuitous. These etymologies are, of course, less well founded than the preceding ones since the meaning remains conjectural. But in connection with the etymological interpretation of glosses they have some definite weight. Some of these onomastic elements are:

αἰζ- in Αἰζική, the name of a part of Thrace: IE **aig-*; cf. Gr. αἶξ 'goat'

- βεβρυκ- in Bέβρυκες name of a tribe : IE **bhebhru-*; cf. OI *babhrus* 'brown' and Lith. *bēbrus*, OHG *bibâr* 'beaver'
- βεργ- in the toponyms Βέργα, Βέργισον, Βεργούλη : IE **bhergh-*; cf. OCS *brěgъ* 'bank, mountain', Germ. *Berg* 'mountain'
- βυζ(α)- in the toponym Βυζάντιον and in the personal names Βύζας, Βύζης etc. : IE **bhūgo-*; cf. Avest. *būza-* 'he-goat', Arm. *buz* 'lamb'
- γερμ- in the toponyms Γερμανία, Γερμαή, Γέρμεννε, Γέρμαι, *Germisara* : IE **g^wherm-*; cf. Gr. θερμός, Lat. *formus*, OI *gharmas* – all 'hot'
- διζα in the names of the towns *Beodizos*, *Burtudizos*, *Ostudizo*, and Τυρόδιζα, and in the personal names Διζαζελμς, Διζαπης, and Διζαστης : IE **digh-*; cf. OPers. *didā* 'fortress', also Gr. τεῖχος 'wall'
- έσβ- in the personal names *Esbenus*, Έσβενειος, Έξβενς : IE **ek^wos*; cf. OI *aśvas*, Lat. *equus* 'horse'
- ζαικα in the personal names Ζαικα, Ζαικεθενθς, *Saecus*, *Zaecethures*, *Zaecaepor* : IE **ghāi-*; cf. OCS *zajecъ* 'hare', Lat. *haedus* 'young he-goat', Goth. *gaitis* 'goat', OI *hayas* 'horse' and *jihīte* 'jumps', Arm. *ji* 'horse'
- ζαλδ- in the toponym Ζάλδαπα and in the ethnica Σαλδοβυσσηνός, Σαλδοκεληνός : IE **ghold-*; cf. Goth. *gulþ* and OCS *zlato*, both 'gold'
- ζενης in the personal names Αύλουζένης, *Diuzenes*, *Mucasemus*, etc. : IE *-génēs*; cf. Gr. Διογένης
- ζηρινθ- in Ζηρινθία and *Zerynthius* (epitheta of Artemis and Apollon) : IE **ghwēr-*; cf. Gr. θήρ, Lat. *fēra*, OCS *zvěrb*, and Lith. *žvėris*, all 'wild beast'; cf. the Greek epiclipsis of Artemis: πότνια θηρῶν
- κελλη in the toponyms Κελλη and *Syracella*, and in the ethnica Κελληνός and Σαλδοκελληνός : IE **g^welnā*; cf. OHG *quella* 'spring'

- κοζα- in the personal names Κοζας, Κοζειλας, Κοζιβιθς, Κοζινηθς, Κοζιστης, Κοζεικενθος, etc. : IE **kogā*; cf. OCS *koza* 'goat'
- μαρι in the place names *Marene* and *Tramarisca*, and in the name of the river Μάρισος : IE **mari*; cf. Lat. *mare* and OCS *more*, both 'sea' (originally 'marsh')
- μαρο- in the personal names Βηριμαρος, Ζμερτομαρος, Καρσιμαρος, and Καρτομαρος : IE **mēro-/mōro-/māro-*; cf.: Gr. ἐγγεσίμωρος 'great in fighting with the spear'; OIr. *mōr*, *mār* 'big'; Goth. *mērs* 'big'. Cf. also the Celtic names *Catumarus*, *Dannomarus*, *Maromagus*, and Germ. *Volkmar* and *Hlodomar*, ORuss. *Volodimirъ*, OCS *Vladimirъ*
- παρα in the names of towns such as Βαζοπαρα, Βενδιπαρα, Βηρίπαρα, Βόσπαρα, Βρεντοπαρα, Γελουπαρα, Δαρδάπαρα, and many others : IE **per-/por-*; cf. OI *pāras*, Gr. πόρος 'ford, ferry, river'
- πορις in personal names such as Αύλουπορις, Δαλεπορις, Δινδιπορις, Κετριπορις, Μοκαπορις, Ραισκούπορις, *Aulupor*, *Zecaepor*, *Natoporus* : IE **por-*; cf. Gr. πόρτις 'calf' and Lat. *parere* 'bear'
- ρήσ- in the personal name Πῆσος (a Thracian king mentioned by Homer) : IE **rēg-*; cf. OI *rājā*, Lat. *rēx*, and Gall. *-rīx*, all 'king'
- σερμ- in Σέρμη (name of a river) and in the name of the town Σερμούλη : IE **serm-*; cf. OI *sarmas* 'stream'
- σουητουλ- in Σουητουληνός, Σουιτουληνός (epitheton of a hero) : IE **kwoitulo-/kwoitilo-*; cf. OCS *světlъ* 'clear, bright'
- σπαρα- in the personal names Σπαράδοκος and Σπάρτακος : IE **sparo-*; cf. Lat. *sparus* and Germ. *Speer*, both 'lance'
- ut- in the names of the rivers *Utus*, Οὔτως, and others : IE **udō(r)*; cf. Gr. ὕδωρ and OI *udakam*, both 'water'

wisa- in the ethnica Σαλδοουισσηνός, Σαλδοουισσηνός, Σαλτοβουσσηνός: IE **wiso-*; cf. OI *višam* 'poison' (originally liquid'). Cf. also Gr. ἰός and Lat. *vīrus*, both 'poison'

These selected examples convey a fairly well founded idea of the possibilities and the limitations of Thracian etymology. Far from being sure, especially when the source material is onomastic and the meanings hence only presumed, these equations are by far too plausible and present such an undeniable possibility of Indo-European etymological interpretation that they cannot be rejected as unworthy of consideration, but for all their lack of full probabilistic security, have to be taken most seriously into consideration, with all due reserve, of course, and with an open mind for possible corrections. In this field of Indo-European etymology it is impossible to reach the standard degree of certainty and definiteness.

Having thus at our disposal a set of Thracian etymologies which, for all their weaknesses, allow us to regard with confidence Thracian as an Indo-European language, it becomes necessary to examine, at least roughly, its phonemic correspondences and to integrate it, as well as possible, into the network of Indo-European comparative linguistics. Such an attempt has, of course, to overcome very serious difficulties of which the small number and poor quality of the etymological equations is only one. Another major difficulty is the indirect tradition of this linguistic material.

Everything one can work with was transmitted through the medium of Greek or Latin; it was written by people speaking these languages and belonging to the cultural sphere of European Antiquity. This means that philological care in the handling of words that belonged to barbarian languages was something completely foreign to them. Our Thracian material does not derive directly from native speakers, not even in the sense in which our Greek and Latin material does but it is known only through a probably careless adaptation to Greek linguistic usage and linguistic convenience. It should not be forgotten that every speaker of Greek thought highly

of his own inability to reproduce a Thracian word accurately and appreciated this as a sign of cultural refinement. The Greek and Latin spellings of Thracian names and glosses are therefore only approximations far below the standards of ancient orthography. Many dilemmas of Thracian comparative phonology are caused by this state of affairs.

The central problem of Thracian consonantism is whether for this language a consonant shift, comparable to that of Germanic, Armenian, and possibly Pelasgian, has to be assumed or not. In the last analysis this is a question of the interpretation of Greek and Latin spellings. It can be reduced to the alternative choice of the variant forms Σπάρτακος or Σπαρτυχος, *Bitus* or *Bithus*, *Agatapara* or *Breierophara* as basic and more adequate renderings of the Thracian forms. In the same way one has to choose between Βριαντική and *Priantae*, Κραστιωνία and Γραστιωνία, Σπαράδοκος and Σπάρτακος. It is clear that in such a matter the opinions of the scholars remain divided and divergent. The only safe conclusion is that Greek and Latin writers met with difficulties when rendering Thracian stops in their familiar alphabet. This has been explained in three ways: as a full-fledged consonant shift,²⁴⁰ as the orthographic representation of an articulation of stops somehow different from the Greek one and similar to the articulation of stops in Albanian,²⁴¹ as a late attempt at graphical grecization.²⁴²

The Indo-European palatal stops seem to appear in Thracian as sibilants. In this respect Thracian is, as far as our present knowledge goes, most probably a satem language; see above the etymologies of βρίζα, ζαλμός, ζετραία, ζήλας, αἰζ-, βυζα-, διζα-, έσβ-, ζαικα, ζαλδ-, -ζενης, ζηρινω-, κοζα-, ρησ-, and σουητουλ-. In this point the opinions of scholars converge. They are less unanimous about the Thracian development of Indo-European labiovelars. In some etymologies they appear as pure velars (cf. above γέντον, γερυ-, and κέλλη). This is the development one should expect in a satem language. Most scholars accept such an interpret-

²⁴⁰ Cf. DEČEV (1960: 148–55) and GEORGIEV (1966a: 129).

²⁴¹ Cf. JOKL (1929: 289–90).

²⁴² Cf. RUSSU (1969a: 167).

ation of the etymological data.²⁴³ Others believe that the original labio-velars were, at least partly, preserved in Thracian. This view is based on the toponyms Κουιμέδαβα 'Ακυενύσιον and the Dacian plant names κοαδάμα and γουολήτα, translated as ποταμο-γείτων 'pondweed' and λιθόσπερμον 'gromwell'. In the first plant name the word IE *ak^wā 'water' is recognized.²⁴⁴ The evidence in favour of a merger of pure velars and labiovelars appears to be stronger.

Thracian preserves the distinction between the Indo-European liquidae *r* and *l*, and the nasals *m* and *n* remain also unchanged. The same applies to the spirant *s*. Examples can easily be found among the etymologies quoted above. The inadequacy of Greek writing does not allow us to be as positive about *y* and *w*.

A most characteristic Thracian feature is the alternation of *b* and *m*. Cf.:

Ἀβυδών:	Ἀμυδών
Ἀνδραβυς:	Ἀδραμυς
Βάργος:	Μάργος
Βάστειρα:	Μάστειρα
Βενδῖς:	Μενδῖς
Βουζεός:	Μουσαῖος
Δόβηρος:	Domerus
Σερβολία:	Σερμυλία
Τιβισκος:	Τιμησις

Other Thracian consonantal changes are the insertion of *t* between *s* and *r* (cf. Στρυμών : IE *sru- 'stream'; cf. Gr. ῥυθμός 'any regularly recurring motion' and ῥύαξ 'rushing stream'; Ἰστρος : IE *isāros 'strong, swift'; cf. OI *iširas* 'swift' and Gr. ἱερός 'strong, sacred'), further the assibilation of dentals before palatal

²⁴³ Cf. DEČEV (1960: 159–61), GEORGIEV (1966a: 129), RUSSU (1969a: 168).

²⁴⁴ This view is a part of the Pelastic theory as proposed by BUDIMIR (cf. above p. 63-). Based on the examples quoted here, it is put forward by JOKL (1929: 293).

²⁴⁵ Cf. DEČEV (1960: 167–8) and POGHIRC (1963).

phonemes (cf. Βενδῖς : Βενζεις; Δειζας : Ζειζας; *Dines* : *Zines*; *Diu-zenes* : *Zie-pyrus*; Ζβελθιουρδος : Ζβελσουρδος; Διέρνα : Ζέρνης) and the change of velars in the same position into affricatae (cf. Κίντος : *Tzinto*; *Mucipara* : Μουτζίπαρα).

The Thracian vocalism presents even more difficulties since the graphic rendering is still less stable, and many forms are suspect of adaptation to Greek models. The central problem is that of IE *o*. It cannot be established with certainty whether it merged with *a* or remained distinct from it. There is much hesitation in the rendering of Thracian names (cf. Πορόλισσος : *Paralisenses*; *Costoboci* : *Castobocae*; Μήτοκος : Μήτακος; *Potaissa* : *Patavissa*). Many etymologies seem to confirm that IE short *o* appears in Thracian as *a* (cf. above ζαλμός, μανδάκη, σκάλη, ζαλδ-, -παρα). Some scholars take this to be the effect of regular sound change and explain all contrary examples otherwise: either as adaptations to Greek sound patterns or as being of some other (Phrygian e.g.) and not of Thracian origin, or as a foreign rendering of Thracian *u* which like all vowels seems to have been articulated very openly.²⁴⁶

There is also the explanation that Thracian itself was differentiated in this respect, some dialects preserving *o*, others merging it with *a*.²⁴⁷ The view has also been put forward that Thracian preserved the opposition between *a* and *o*, all mergers being late dialectal developments without importance for the comparative characterization of the language.²⁴⁸

Sonantic liquidae and nasals seem to have developed an auxiliary vowel which in Greek writing appears as *u* or *o*; cf. above the etymologies of βόλινθος and βρυγχός).²⁴⁹

Although some of the results obtained by the comparative phonology of Thracian are fairly sound and can be reasonably trusted, there is no doubt that this kind of studies is based on some optimistic overconfidence in the power of the etymological method. The authors write as if it was possible to establish firm equations where

²⁴⁶ Cf. DEČEV (1960: 175–6), GEORGIEV (1960: 104–6; 1966a: 129).

²⁴⁷ Cf. JOKL (1929: 284–5).

²⁴⁸ Cf. RUSSU (1969a: 164–5).

²⁴⁹ Cf. DEČEV (1960: 184–5) and GEORGIEV (1966a: 129).

– as in reality – a fairly probable guess is already a remarkable success. In this field, we admittedly know something, but it is not probable that we shall ever know much more. In any case, this is not the part of Thracian studies that seems to hold the greatest promise.

The etymological investigations of the Thracian linguistic material thus show that Thracian was an Indo-European satem language with a history of sound change very similar to and almost indistinguishable from Georgiev's Pelasgian. One cannot help wondering whether the most trustworthy Pelasgian etymologies are not just indications of very ancient Thracian loans in the Greek vocabulary.

The preserved fragments of the Thracian vocabulary show a marked tendency toward correspondences with Slavic and Baltic forms.²⁵⁰ These are correspondences of whole words, not only of roots, and thus testify to a remarkable closeness of Thracian to the Indo-European languages north of it.

Of considerable importance are recent attempts to approach the Thracian material from the point of view of onomastics. In this way, its study becomes much more fruitful for the history of culture; the starting points of etymological combinations become more precise, the range of possible equations being thus more restricted. In this field a good start has been made.²⁵¹

Another expanding field of Thracian studies in our days is centred around the areal distribution of linguistic elements. The question of the western border of Thracian towards Illyrian has always been felt to be a major one. It was treated in a comprehensive monograph whose results are as complete and conclusive as can be obtained with the scanty information given by the scarce source material.²⁵² The border-line remains uncertain after all that has been said and it seems that it was not quite stable in antiquity but changed to a certain extent from epoch to epoch.

A new point of view was brought into the discussion by V.

²⁵⁰ Cf. VLAHOV (1969) and DURIDANOV (1969a).

²⁵¹ Cf. BEŠEVILIEV (1963; 1970a, 1970b), CANKOVA-PETKOVA (1963), GÄLÄBOV (1963), SIMEONOV (1963), ZAIMOV (1963), VLAHOV (1965, 1966a, 1966b)

²⁵² Cf. RUSSU (1941–43).

Georgiev. He started from the observation that along with the toponyms which went through a complete consonant shift there are in the Thracian area others which in their sound pattern show no trace of such a development. Cf., e.g., 'Εριγών (the name of a river in Thrace and of one in Macedonia; the latter is today called *Črna reka* 'black river' – the name can thus be derived from IE **ereg*- 'dark'; cf. Gr. ἔρεβος 'darkness', Arm. *erek* 'evening'); Λύγιμος (the name of a river in northern Thrace, a tributary of the Danube) can be derived from IE **leug-/lug-* (cf. Lith. *liūgas* 'swamp', *lūgai* 'pool, swamp'); and Σαλμυδησσός (the name of a river and of a town on the sea-coast of south-eastern Thrace) can be derived from IE **salm-udes-* 'salty water' (cf. Gr. ἅλμη 'sea water, brine' and ὕδωρ 'water'). From these data, Georgiev concludes that in the eastern part of the Balkanic mainland two Indo-European linguistic strata, one with a complete consonant shift, the other without it, have left their traces in ancient toponymy.²⁵³

If we observe the areal distribution of the two patterns of sound change in Thracian toponymy, it appears that north of the Danube there is no instance of consonant shift. This can be illustrated with the names of tributaries of the Danube. From the south come the rivers *Utus* (from IE **udes-* 'water') and Ἄθρυς (from IE **ētrus* 'quick'; cf. Lith. *ātrs* 'quick'), both with consonant shift, while from the north comes *Vrdea* (from IE **wed-* 'water') with the Indo-European stop unchanged.²⁵⁴

The most frequent types of Thracian place names show an areal distribution which corresponds either with the zone of consonant shift or with the other one without it. The border between the northern area and the southern one here is not the Danube but the Haemus, the Balkan range. There are types of names of settlements which occur only, or in the overwhelming majority of all instances, north of the Haemus. Such are the toponyms in *-dava* (*-deva*). Cf., e.g.: *Acidava*, Ἀργεδαυον, *Burridava*, Δοκίδαυα, Ζαργίδαυα, Ζιρίδαυα, Ζουσίδαυα, Καρσίδαυα, Κληπίδαυα, Κομίδαυα, Μαρκόδαυα, Πιροβορίδαυα, and other such names of settlements in

²⁵³ Cf. GEORGIEV (1957b: 69–70; 1966a: 138–9).

²⁵⁴ Cf. GEORGIEV (1957b: 73; 1966a: 148).

Dacia, 47 in all, 9 instances (Ἀεδάβη, Καπίδαυα, Σουκίδαυα, *e.a.*) between the Danube and the Haemus (in the Lower Moesia of the Romans): 8 instances (Αἰαδάβα, Ζισνούδεβα, Κουιμέδαβα, *e.a.*) in the westernmost part of the Thracian area (in the Upper Moesia of the Romans); finally (in Thrace proper) only one instance (*Pulpudeva*). There is in addition one isolated occurrence outside the Thracian area in Dalmatia (Θερμίδαυα).

A corresponding areal distribution can be established for the names in *-upa* (1 instance in Lower Moesia (Ἀζίοπα), 1 in Dacia (*Scenopa*)) and for those in *-sara* (2 instances in Dacia (*Germisara*, *Deusara*), 2 in Lower Moesia (Παδισάρα, *Sarpisara*), 1 in Thrace proper (Ἀντισάρα)).

Other types of toponyms occur only, or in their overwhelming majority, south of the Haemus in Thrace proper. Most frequent are the toponyms in *-para* with 37 instances in all. Their area is restricted to Thrace proper (cf., e.g., *Agatapara*, *Bessapara*, Βηρίπαρα, Βρεντοπαρά, Στρατοπαρά, *e.a.*) and Upper Moesia (cf., e.g., Δαρδάπαρά, Πρισκούπερα, Σκαρίπαρά, Χεσδούπαρά, *e.a.*). The names in *-diza* (11 in all) occur in Thrace proper only (cf. e.g., *Bedizos*, Κιστιδιζος, *Tarpodizos*, and Τυρόδιζα). The names in *-bria* occur also only in Thrace proper (13 in all; cf., e.g., Βολβάβρια, Κώμβρεια, Μεσημβρία, Σηλυμβρία, *e.a.*). Of the names in *Burd-* (7 in all), 6 occur in Thrace proper (cf., e.g., *Burdapa*, *Burdipta*, *Burticom*) and only one occurs in Dacia (*Burticum*). All names in *Berga* (Βέργη, Βεργέπολις, Βέργισον, Βεργούλη) occur in Thrace proper.²⁵⁵

This complementary areal distribution of toponomastic types cannot be easily explained as the result of pure chance. The etymologies on the basis of which the consonant shift is established may be questionable and the difference between one stop-shifting language and another one in which such a shift did not occur may therefore be suspected of being only a mirage.²⁵⁶ But the distribution of toponomastic types is something much more positive and cannot

²⁵⁵ Cf. GEORGIEV (1958c: 90–107; 1960a: 85–6; 1966a: 139–40).

²⁵⁶ REICHENKRON (1966: 201–26) professes the view that Dacian had a full consonant shift.

be disregarded lightly. Georgiev has thus a firm basis for his conclusion that in the linguistic complex called by the ancient writers Thracian at least two Indo-European languages have to be distinguished: one Thracian to the south of the Haemus and the other Daco-Mysian to the north of it. Dacian is the historic name of the tribes to the north of the Danube and Mysians lived between this river and mount Haemus to the south. The traces of Daco-Mysian sound patterns and onomastic types south of the Haemus in Thrace proper and in Roman Upper Moesia to the west of it can best be explained as the result of a Daco-Mysian invasion of the southern country. When the Greeks came to know Thrace better, Daco-Mysian ethnic and linguistic elements were there mixed with the older Thracian. Therefore the whole complex of peoples and languages from the Aegean and the Straits till the Carpathians could appear to them as being one.²⁵⁷

The areal distribution of Thracian personal names has not as yet been investigated in detail, but it has been shown that in anthroponymy also some elements have a characteristic Daco-Mysian distribution while others are restricted to Thrace proper. Thus Δορζένθης and Σεύθης seem to be *stricto sensu* Thracian, while *Decebalus* and *Scorilo* are Daco-Mysian.²⁵⁸

The sound pattern of Daco-Mysian differs, according to Georgiev, in some essential points from the Thracian one. This is indicated by etymologies such as: διέσεμα ‘mullein, *Verbascum sinuatum*’ (the Dacian name of a plant called in German ‘Himmelbrand’): IE **diyes eusmn* ‘burning of the heaven’ (cf. Lat. *dies* ‘day’ and Gr. εὔω ‘burn’); Ἀζίοπα (a town on the mouth of the Danube, today *Cernavoda* ‘black water’): IE **h₂ksei* ‘dark’ and *upā* ‘water’ (cf. Avest. *axšaēna-* ‘dark’ and Lith. *upė* ‘river, creek’); Βετεσπιος, Ουτασπιος (Dacian personal names): IE **ekwo-* ‘horse’; Δᾱχοι (name of the Dacian people): IE **dhauko-* ‘strangler’ (cf. Phrygian δᾱος ‘wolf’, OCS *daviti* ‘to strangle’); Αἰζισις, Azisis (a Dacian

²⁵⁷ Cf. GEORGIEV (1957b: 73–4; 1958c: 107–14; 1960a: 85–9; 1966a: 139–40).

²⁵⁸ Cf. GEORGIEV (1960a: 86–9). For Dacian names, cf. RUSSU (1941–48) and KERÉNYI (1970).

toponym): IE **aig-* 'goat' (cf. Gr. *αἴξ* 'goat'); *Κρίσος* (name of a river, today *Crișul Negru*): IE **kr̥so-* 'black' (cf. Bulg. *čer* 'black'). To these Dacian etymologies we may add some Mysian ones from Asia Minor; the most important of them are: *μυσός* 'beech': IE **bhuǵos* 'beech' (cf. Slavic *bъzъ* 'elder'); *patrizi* (on the only Mysian inscription²⁵⁹): dat.pl. of IE **pātēr* (cf. OI *pitṛśu*, Gr. *πατράσι*).

These etymologies, if they are correct, show that Daco-Mysian, too, was a satem language, that it had no consonant shift, that *r* (and *l*) was changed to *ri* (and *li*), while *n* (and *m*) appear as *a*. The diphthongs with *w* lose their sonantal component. Thus Daco-Mysian can be identified as an Indo-European language clearly distinct from Thracian.²⁶⁰

Interesting as they are, these fragments of a Daco-Mysian comparative phonology are less well founded than the similar attempts for Thracian. The trustworthy etymologies are less in number and the established sound correspondences remain only inspiring guesses. For all its obvious short-comings, Georgiev's sketch of Daco-Mysian comparative phonology cannot be discarded as irrelevant. Some of the etymologies look really sound, but they are so few that the whole construction must be handled with much reserve (cf. COX-CAMERON 1942).

The language of the Phrygians of Asia Minor also belongs in some way to the Thracian complex, for in antiquity they were known to have been immigrants from the Thracian Balkan. Their language is known from inscriptions. It is undoubtedly Indo-European and seems to be relatively closely related to Greek. Its sound pattern, hotly debated in some points including the controversy of centum *versus* satem, is clearly distinct from Thracian and from Daco-Mysian, as far as we can judge. As far as our linguistic sources go, Phrygian is a language of Asia Minor. We shall avoid

²⁵⁹ Cf. COX - CAMERON (1942). While this book was in print, I was informed in conversation by Professor G. NEUMANN that this inscription has been shown to be Phrygian. Consequently, it cannot be used for Mysian etymology.

²⁶⁰ Cf. GEORGIEV (1957b: 80-4; 1960a: 89-95; 1964b; 1966a: 140-5).

²⁶¹ Cf. Herodotus 7.73 and Stephanus Byzantinus s.v.

therefore to go here into details about its sound correspondences and its relation to Armenian (the Armenians are said to have been Phrygian colonists)²⁶¹. The original Phrygian area on the Balkans seems to have been the valley of the Erigon in Paeonia. Even the opinion that the Paeonians were of Phrygian stock was put forward.²⁶²

In connection with the Thracian complex, the opinion of D. Dečev has to be mentioned. This scholar, a most competent specialist in the field of Thracian, who died in 1958 and did not thus come to know Georgiev's distinction between Thracian and Daco-Mysian, professed the view that Thracian was a mixed language which had emerged from the crossing of an Etruscan or Etruscoid population with Indo-European Iranians.²⁶³ This teaching has been universally rejected. It is connected with Kretschmer's assumption of an "*Protindogermanisch*" stratum on the Balkan²⁶⁴ which cannot be said to have been a success. Furthermore, a concept of mixture is not apt to elucidate the genetic affiliations of a language.²⁶⁵

The Thracian and Dacian substratum has also left some traces in the vocabulary of the modern languages of the area. Research on Dacian substratum words in Rumanian, in spite of the many controversies it has raised, has brought forth such important relations of correspondences that it has to be taken seriously.²⁶⁶ Substratum words have also been established in Bulgarian²⁶⁷, and some Thracian influence on Bulgarian anthroponymy has been made probable.²⁶⁸

²⁶² Cf. GEORGIEV (1957b: 77-83; 1960a: 104-8, 124-9; 1966a: 149-54, 167-71, 196-7). About Phrygian, cf. JOKL (1927-28), RUGE (1941), FRIEDRICH (1941), OBERHUMMER (1897), WERNER (1969). For a comparative description of Phrygian and its relation to Armenian, cf. HAAS (1939, 1957, 1960a, 1960b 1961b), DEČEV (1960: 186-90).

²⁶³ Cf. DEČEV (1960: 198-201).

²⁶⁴ Cf. above 2.3.4.

²⁶⁵ Cf. KATIČIĆ (1970: 118-36).

²⁶⁶ Cf. VRACIU (1963, 1964), REICHENKRON (1966), RUSSU (1969a: 211-55), POGHIRC (1967), RUSSU (1970).

²⁶⁷ Cf. GEORGIEV (1958c: 35-46).

²⁶⁸ Cf. DURIDANOV (1960).

The Dacian substratum words in Rumanian often have very interesting correspondences in Albanian, a fact which becomes significant when one tries to solve the problem of the origins of Albanian. A survey of this complex question we shall reserve for the last chapter (cf. below p. 184).

Rumanian words explained as Dacian are among others:

fărîmă 'piece': Alb. *thërrimë* 'crumb'
a lehăi 'to chatter': Alb. *ljev* 'to bark'
mal 'mountain': Alb. *mal* 'mountain'
mare 'big': Alb. *math* 'big'
stînă 'sheep farm': Alb. *shtëzë* 'animal'

The opinions of scholars who in Rumanian etymology operate with Dacian substratum words diverge so much that it is not easy to find Rumanian words on the Dacian origin of which general consensus has been reached.

Bulgarian words whose origin has been explained as Thracian are, among others, the following ones:

karpa 'rock': Alb. *karpë* 'rock'
rofeja, rufja 'lightning': Alb. *rrufë* 'thunder, lightning',
 'Thracian lance'
katerja se 'I climb': Rum. *a se cățără*, Alb. *kërcej* 'to jump'

Here are, furthermore, some Bulgarian personal names without clear etymologies in Slavic and Orthodox-Christian onomastics and with interesting Thracian and Albanian correspondences:

Bulg.	Thrac.	Alb.
<i>Bešo</i>		<i>Besa</i>
<i>Buzo</i>		<i>Buzo</i>
<i>Dado</i>	<i>Dada</i>	<i>Dada</i>
<i>Dardan</i>		<i>Dardha</i>
<i>Dido</i>	<i>Dida</i>	<i>Dido, Didha</i>
<i>Dilo</i>		<i>Dilo, Dile</i>
<i>Duro</i>		<i>Dura</i>

Bulg.	Thrac.	Alb.
<i>Kuto</i>		<i>Kuta</i>
<i>Suko</i>		<i>Suka</i>
<i>Zajko</i>	<i>Zaxa</i>	<i>Zajka</i>
<i>Zura</i>		<i>Zura</i>

Whatever one may think of these correspondences, there are too many of them (Duridanov has collected 45), and the connection with Albanian is too regular for a general rejection of these testimonies.

Only little can be said about Thracian and Dacian substratum influences in the modern languages of their area. Yet, it can be stated quite safely that the existence of such influences has been made very probable and that in some cases it can even be said to have been established.

5. THE ILLYRIAN COMPLEX

5.1 HISTORICAL AND GEOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND

In Strabo's sketch of the country south of the Danube, the Illyrians are the north-western barbarians who settle between that river and the shore of the Adriatic.²⁶⁹ Appian states this more explicitly. He says that the Greeks number among the Illyrians all those who live above the Epirots to the Danube, this being the length of the country, and from the Macedonians and the Thracian mountaineers to the Pannonians, the Ionian sea, and the foothills of the Alps, this being its breadth.²⁷⁰ This Greek usage of the term *Illyrian* is, though manifestly late, nevertheless highly important since Appian introduces it as being opposed to and therefore independent of the Roman administrative organization. It refers thus to a Greek terminology which is not derived from the institution of the "Illyrian provinces" and can be regarded as prior to it.

This broad use of the term *Illyrian* in Greek literature is definitely not the oldest one. There are ancient instances of its more restricted application. In the Macedonian history of the fifth and sixth century B.C., *Illyrian* had a quite definite political meaning

²⁶⁹ Cf. above p. 14–5.

²⁷⁰ Cf. Appian, *Illyrica* 1: "Ἕλληνες ἡγοῦνται τοὺς ὑπὲρ τε Μακεδονίαν καὶ Θράκην ἀπὸ Χαόνων καὶ Θεσπρωτῶν ἐπὶ ποταμὸν Ἰστρον καὶ τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τῆς χώρας τὸ μῆκος· εὐρὸς δὲ ἐκ Μακεδόνων τε καὶ Θρακῶν τῶν ὀρειῶν, ἐπὶ Παίονας καὶ τὸν Ἰόνιον καὶ τὰ πρόποδα τῶν Ἀλπεων καὶ ἔστι τὸ μὲν εὐρὸς ἡμερῶν πέντε, τὸ δὲ μῆκος τριάκοντα.

and denoted a kingdom on the north-western borders of Upper Macedonia. Describing the campaign led in 423 B.C. by Perdiccas, king of Macedonia, and Brasidas, the Lacedaemonian commander, against Arrabaeus, king of Lynceus in Upper Macedonia, Thucydides mentions Illyrians who ended the contest by siding with the Lyncestae.²⁷¹ In this account the Illyrian name is clearly no loose ethnical designation, but a precise political term which for Thucydides and his readers needed no further qualification. The troops described as Illyrian belonged apparently to the Illyrian kingdom which repeatedly appears in the sources as an active and hostile neighbour of Macedonia.²⁷² This Illyrian kingdom had in the reign of its known sovereigns (Sirrhas, Bardylis, Grabos, Pleuratos, Kleitos, Glaukias, Bardylis II, Monunios, and Mytilios) an eventful history in the course of which it was united with the kingdom of the Taulantians in the country around Dyrrachium, thus getting an access to the Adriatic shore.²⁷³

This was the first step in the following expansion of the Illyrian power, and its further direction was toward the middle Adriatic. On the island of Pharos (the Hvar of today) a coin of king Mytilios was found²⁷⁴ and the hero founder of Issa (the Vis of today) is also called an Illyrian.²⁷⁵ The center of the Illyrian kingdom shifted successively to the coast, and it thus became a major naval power.

²⁷¹ Cf. Thucydides 4. 124.4–125.1: μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο τρόπαιον στήσαντες δύο μὲν ἢ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἐπέσχον, τοὺς Ἰλλυριοὺς μένοντες οἱ ἔτυχον τῷ Περδίκκᾳ μισθοῦ μέλλοντες ἤξειν, ἔπειτα Περδίκκας ἐβούλετο προιεῖναι ἐπὶ τὰς τοῦ Ἀρραβαίου κόμας καὶ μὴ καθῆσθαι, Βρασίδας δὲ τῆς τε Μένδης περιοριώμενος, μὴ τῶν Ἀθηναίων πρότερον ἐπιπλευσάντων τι ἀθῆναι, καὶ ἅμα τῶν Ἰλλυριῶν οὐ παρόντων, οὐ πρόθυμος ἦν, ἀλλὰ ἀναχωρεῖν μᾶλλον. καὶ ἐν τούτῳ διαφερομένων αὐτῶν ἠγγέλθη ὅτι καὶ οἱ Ἰλλυριοὶ μετ' Ἀρραβαίους, προδόντες Περδίκκᾳ, γέγνηνται.

²⁷² Cf. Diodorus 14.92.3; 15.19.2; 16.2.2, 8–9; 16.4.3 – 16.5; 16.8.1; Plutarchus, *De educatione puerorum* 14 b; Polyaeus 4.10. 1; Libanius 8 p. 606, 18; Suidas s.v. *Κάρανος*; Iustinus 7.5.1, 7.6.7.

²⁷³ Cf. Demosthenes, *I Olynthiacus* 23: Ἀλλὰ μὴν τὸν γε Παίονα καὶ τὸν Ἰλλυριὸν καὶ ἀπλῶς τούτοις ἅπαντας ἡγεῖσθαι χρὴ αὐτονομῶν ἢ διὸν ἂν καὶ ἐλευθέρων ἢ δούλων εἶναι.

²⁷⁴ Cf. BRUNSMID (1898: 54).

²⁷⁵ Cf. Theopompus in Strabo 7.5.9; Scholia to Apollonius Rhodius 4.308; Scholia to Pindarus, *Olympia* 3.120; Scholia to Lycophron, *Alexandra* 631.

In this capacity it came into hostile relations with the Greek communities on the Ionian and the Adriatic shores. They were not able to free themselves of the Illyrian pressure until they asked for Roman intervention which, after many vicissitudes, ended in 168 B.C. with a complete submission of the Illyrian state.

The known Illyrian sovereigns of this "maritime" period were Pleuratos, Agron, Pinnes, Skerdilaidas, Pleuratos II, and Gentios, the last Illyrian king. The territories acquired by the Romans in in these wars became the nucleus of the Illyrian provinces. The *Illyricum regnum* was thus transformed into the *provincia Illyrica* and extended afterwards far beyond its original borders.²⁷⁶

The Illyrian name was not confined to the designation of a political entity. As early as the fifth century B.C. it was already applied to a large ethnic group whose territory extended deep into the Balkanic mainland. Herodotus says that the Angros river (the western Morava and the Ibar of today) has its springs among the Illyrians.²⁷⁷ To the interior of the Balkans belong also the Veneti, a people described by Herodotus as Illyrian.²⁷⁸

This ethnic designation was successively extended to an ever broader circle of peoples who for one reason or another were regarded to be cognate with those originally designated as *Illyrians*. On the Adriatic coast we can to a certain extent follow the extension of the Illyrian name from the south to the north. Eratosthenes in his geographic work, describing the eastern Adriatic shore, says that after the Illyrians there came the Nestaeans.²⁷⁹ These Nestaeans were a tribe that lived on the mouth of the Nestos river

²⁷⁶ For the history of political Illyria and about its basic unity and continuity in all periods of history, cf. the masterly studies PAPAZOGLU (1965, 1967). About the social and political structure of the Illyrian state, cf. PAPAZOGLU (1967).

²⁷⁷ Cf. Herodotus 4.49: ἐξ Ἰλλυριῶν δὲ ῥέων πρὸς βορρην ἄνεμον Ἀγγρος ποταμὸς ἐσβάλλει ἐς πεδίον τὸ Τριβαλλικὸν καὶ ἐς ποταμὸν Βρόγγον, ὃ δὲ Βρόγγος ἐς τὸν Ἰστρον, οὕτω ἀμφοτέρους ἔοντας μεγάλους ὁ Ἰστρος δέκεται.

²⁷⁸ Cf. Herodotus 1.196: τῶ καὶ Ἰλλυριῶν Ἑνετοὺς πυνθάνομαι χρᾶσθαι. Cf. KRAHE (1939).

²⁷⁹ Cf. Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium 4.1215: [...] καὶ Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν γ' Γεωγραφουμένων φησί μετὰ Ἰλλυριοῦς Νεσταιοί, καθ' οὗς νῆσος Φάρος, Παρίων ἄποικος.

(the Cetina of today), on the mainland opposite the island of Pharos. For the geographer of the third century B.C. they were not Illyrians but their north-western neighbours.

Pseudo-Scymnus in his *Periegesis* gives a similar delimitation of the Illyrian territory. He says that after the Liburnians to the south-east there are the Bulini and the Hylli and only after them begins the Illyris.²⁸⁰ The Hylli and the Bulini were ancient peoples that settled in the country at the promontory of Diomedes between the estuaries of the Titius river (the Krka of today) and the Nestos. For this geographer, too, they were no Illyrians. He lived in the beginning of the first century B.C. and in this he, no doubt, followed an older source.

The author of the *Periplus* of Pseudo-Scylax, in the text given by the manuscripts, describes the Illyrians as south-eastern neighbours of the Liburnians.²⁸¹ This is very far to the north for an author of the fourth century B.C. But it has been made probable that this passage is a more recent addition while in the original version of Pseudo-Scylax only the Encheleans were introduced as Illyrians and other tribes still farther to the south.²⁸²

For Strabo the Illyrian coast begins with Istria and extends to the Acroceraunian promontory.²⁸³ A similar delimitation is found in Plinius; for him the Illyrian country begins on the river Arsia (the Raša of today) in eastern Istria.²⁸⁴ There is no doubt that these

²⁸⁰ Cf. Pseudo-Scymnus 403-415: [...] Λυβυρνῶν κατέχεται. Τούτοις συνάπτον δ' ἐστὶ Βουλινῶν ἔθνος, ἐξῆς δὲ [...] φασὶ [...] Ὑλλους κατοικεῖν [...] Ἡ δ' Ἰλλυρίς μετὰ ταῦτα παρατείνουσα γῆ. The same delimitation is given by Skylax. Cf. Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium 4.12.15: τοὺς Νεσταιοὺς ἐκύβλας φησὶν ἔθνος Ἰλλυρικόν.

²⁸¹ Cf. Pseudo-Scylax 22: Μετὰ δὲ Λιβυρνοῦς εἰσὶν Ἰλλυριοὶ παρὰ θάλατταν μέχοι Χασονίας τῆς κατὰ Κέρκυραν τὴν Ἀλκινόου νῆσον.

²⁸² Cf. SUIΣ (1955: 136-49, 170-9).

²⁸³ Cf. Strabo 7.5.3: ἔφαμεν δ' ἐν τῇ περιοδείᾳ τῆς Ἰταλίας Ἰστρου εἶναι πρῶτους τῆς Ἰλλυρικῆς παραλίας συνεχεῖς τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ καὶ τοῖς Κάκροις. [...] — 6.3.10: [...] τῶ φερομένῳ διαστήματι τῆς Ἰλλυρικῆς παραλίας ἀπὸ τῶν Κεραυνίων ὁρῶν ἐπὶ τὸν τοῦ Ἀδριοῦ μυχόν, [...].

²⁸⁴ Cf. Plinius, *Naturalis historia* 3.139: *Arsiae gens Liburnorum iungitur usque ad flumen Titium. pars eius fuere Mentores, Himani, Encheleae, Bulini et quos Callimachus Peucetios appellat, nunc totum uno nomine Illyricum vocatur generatim.*

relatively recent geographic writers were influenced by the structure of the Roman administration. The Illyrian coast begins for them in Istria because this was the border between Italy and the province Illyricum.

The ancient writers themselves were aware of these discrepancies and of the variety of uses for the ethnic term *Illyrian*. Therefore they felt the need on some occasions to speak of the Illyrians in the strict sense of the word (*Illyrii proprie dicti*). According to Pomponius Mela these *stricto sensu* Illyrians lived on the Adriatic shore north of the Taulantians and the Encheleians, the most anciently known Illyrian tribes.²⁸⁵

Plinius is more explicit. To him these properly called Illyrians are one of the *civitates*, autonomous political units of the Roman provincial administration that in older times had existed on the coast between Epidaurum (the Cavtat of today) and Lissus (the Lesh of today) on the lower Drilon river (the Drim of today).²⁸⁶

On the eastern coast of the Adriatic the older geographers knew the Ἰστροί on the homonymous peninsula, after them the Λιβυρνοί to the river Καταρβάτης, known also as Titius, and

²⁸⁵ Cf. Pomponius Mela 2.3: *Partheni et Dassaretæ prima tenent: sequentia Taulantii, Encheleæ, Phaeaces. Deinde sunt quos proprie Illyrios vocant: tum Pyraei et Liburni et Istria.*

²⁸⁶ Cf. Plinius, *Naturalis historia* 3.144: *ab Epidaurō sunt oppida civium Romanorum Rhizinium, Acruium, Butuanum, Olcinium, quod antea Colchinium dictum est, a Colchis conditum, amnis Drino superque eum oppidum civium Romanorum Scodra ab mari XVIII, praetera multorum Graeciae oppidorum deficiens memoria nec non et civitatum validarum: eo namque tractu fuere Labeatae, Senedi, Rudini, Sasaei, Grabaei; proprieque dicti Illyri et Taulanti et Pyraei retinent nomen. in ora Nymphaeum promunturium. Lissum oppidum civium Romanorum ab Epidaurō C passuum.*

The term *civitas* here is a technical one and denotes the locally autonomous units of the Roman provincial administration. *Civitates peregrinae* are meant, i.e., political bodies without any form of Roman citizenship. At the beginning of the description of the south-easternmost part of the province Dalmatia we read (*Naturalis historia* 3.142): *Narona colonia tertii conventus a Salona LXXXV passuum, adposita cognominis sui fluvio a mari XX passuum. M. Varro LXXXVIII civitates eo ventitasse auctor est. Here a juridical conventus is meant. In this context it becomes quite clear that the Illyrii proprie dicti were known to Plinius as one of these civitates. Cf. KATIČIĆ (1964b), PAPAZOGLU (1965: 177–9), KATIČIĆ (1966b).*

near them the Μέντορες. South-east of the Titius settled, according to the older sources, the tribes of the Ὑλλοι and the Βουλινοί, further south on the mouth of the Nestos river the Νεσταῖοι, and behind them, on the mouth of the Naron (the Neretva of today) the tribe of the Μανιοί.

Further down, on the Rhizonian gulf (the Boka Kotorska of today), lived the Ἐγγελέαι, still further to the south, in the region of Dyrrachium, the Ταυλάντιοι and the Παρθῖνοι. Further inland, near the lake of Lychnidus, settled the Δασσαρηῖται.

This is the ethnic situation as it was fixed in the tradition of Greek geographical learning. What the Romans found when conquering the eastern shore of the Adriatic sea was quite different. Their experience is preserved for us in the works of Strabo and Plinius, both comparatively very rich in information. The changes that came about between the time of the Greek merchants and explorers and that of the Roman conquerors and administrators can best be explained as the result of important population shifts which by most scholars are connected with the Celtic invasion of the Balkans which took place in 279 and as a consequence of which the Scordisci, a mighty Celtic tribe, remained to settle permanently in the country where the Sava river enters the Danube.²⁸⁷

In the north-west, the situation had not changed much. The peninsula of Histria was still inhabited by the tribe from which it had its name. From the Arsia river on the eastern part of the peninsula to the Titius river was the territory of the Liburnians. Their centre was in the east, in the low and rich country between the river Tedanius (the Zrmanja of today) and the Titius. To the north-west, the steep shore under the mighty range of the Velebit, although belonging to the Liburnians, was remembered as the coast of the Iapods, a strong tribe which lived behind the Velebit on the highland of Lika and in the valley of the Una river. These Iapods were said to have been a people of Illyrians mixed with Celts.²⁸⁸

²⁸⁷ Cf. PAPAZOGLU (1969: 209–) and ŽGANJER (1952).

²⁸⁸ Cf. Strabo 7.5.4: *ἐξῆς δ' ἐστὶν ὁ Ἰαποδικὸς παράπλους χιλίων σταδίων* - Plinius, *Naturalis historia* 3.140: *flumen Telavium quo finitur Iapodia.* -

Between the Titius and the Nestos the coast-land was occupied by new masters, the powerful tribe of the Delmatae, after whom the whole province was named. There is no trace in later sources of the peoples that inhabited this section of the coast in older times. The Delmatae appear for the first time in history in the second century B.C. when the Greek colonists of Issa asked for Roman help against Delmatian pressure on the Greek settlements of the mainland.²⁸⁹

On the coast, the Delmatae were, no doubt, recent conquerors. The centre of their territory was in the interior, in the carst-fields of the Dinarian Alps, especially in the field of Delminium (the Duvno of today), in the fields of Livno and Glamoč, and on both hill-sides of the Dinara range as well as in the valley of the Cetina river and further towards the Adriatic coast.

These Delmatae were newcomers to the sea shore, a strong people which caused many troubles to the Romans and during the period of their administration shaped the ethnic and linguistic face of the central part of the province of Dalmatia. Salona, the metropolis of the province, was on their territory.

We do not know whether the Delmatae appeared on the coast from their homes in the interior, or immigrated from some habitat deeper in the mainland in the course of some more important population shift, by way of a real migration. In the historical sources there is no mention of such a migration. The archaeological and onomastic data show that the Delmatae settled on their historical territory pretty compactly. So it is probable that the range of the Dinarian Alps was their habitat since remote antiquity,

Strabo 4.6.10: καὶ οἱ Ἰάποδες δὲ ἤδη τοῦτο ἐπίμικτον Ἰλλυριοῖς καὶ Κελτοῖς ἔθνος. 7.5.2: μέχρι τῶν Ἰαπύδων, Κελτικοῦ τε ἅμα καὶ Ἰλλυρικοῦ ἔθνους – These divergent affiliations are interestingly described in terms of material culture: the armament of the Iapods was Celtic, their tattoos like those of the Illyrians and the Thracians; cf. 7.5.4: ὁ δ' ὅπλισμός Κελτικός, κατὰ στικτοὶ δ' ὁμοίως τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἰλλυριοῖς καὶ Θραξί. – Cf. MAYER (1940), KURZ (1967).

²⁸⁹ Cf. Polybius 32.9.1-2: ὅτι τῶν Ἰσθίων πλεονάκις πεπρωσθενκότων εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην καὶ διασαφούντων ὅτι Δελματεῖς τὴν χώραν ἀδικοῦσι καὶ τὰς πόλεις τὰς μετ' αὐτῶν τετραγμένας· αὐταὶ δ' εἰσὶν Ἐπέτιον καὶ Τραγύριον.

and that only in the third century B.C. they extended it to the sea.²⁹⁰

East of the mouth of the Nestos, around the mountain range of Biokovo, on the coast opposite the island of Pharos, and in the interior was the territory of another strong tribe, the Ardiaei or Vardaei. They are known to have been at war with the Celts and the Illyrian Autariatae, far in the interior. In the Roman wars with the Illyrian kingdom they were regarded as an important factor. They were dangerous even to Italy. Roman rule was very hard on them. They were deported from the coastal region and lost their former vigour, their numbers were reduced, and they ceased to be important, even only in the limited context of the Roman province.²⁹¹

On the lower Naron lived the Daorsi, on the upper, the Narensii, and further south the Pleraei, Docleates, and Labeatae. Somewhere there was also the *civitas* of the *Illyrii proprie dicti*, probably around Scodra where the last resistance of the Illyrian king Genthius had been crushed. Further south were the rests of the Taulantii and the Parthini, tribes which were among the first to be pacified by Rome.

In the interior, the Illyrian Autariatae were famous as a strong tribe. For some time they were the masters of the Central Balkans. Then they disappeared from the historical scene and in the times of the Roman conquests were only a memory.²⁹²

The northern low-lands between the rivers Sava and Drava as well as the valleys of the rivers that flow from the Dinarian Alps to the Sava, such as Vrbas, Bosna, and Drina, were inhabited by an

²⁹⁰ About the tribe of the Delmatae, cf. the exhaustive monograph of ZANINOVIĆ (1966-67).

²⁹¹ Cf. PAPAZOGLU (1963) and LUČIĆ (1966). Papazoglu rejects the information given by Strabo that the coast of the mainland opposite the island of Pharos was inhabited by the Ardiaei because it is contradictory to other records according to which this tribe seems to have lived more to the south. LUČIĆ tries to reconcile the evidence by assuming migrations. Strabo's location is precise and definite, it is repeated in his work and in accordance with the description of the coast as given by Plinius. Therefore it cannot be rejected, and we must assume that it corresponds with the real situation after the Roman conquest.

²⁹² Cf. PAPAZOGLU (1969: 69-100).

ethnic group that the sources call *Pannonians*. Their tribes were the Colapiani in the valley of the Colapis, the Sisciani at its confluence with the Sava. Further down that river settled the Oseriates and north of them the Iasi. On the confluence of the Drava with the Danube lived the Andizetes and south of them, on the Sava, the Breuci. Easternmost stayed the Cornacates and the Amantini, after them the Celtic Scordisci. Pannonian tribes south of the Sava were the Mezaei in the valley of the Vrbas, the Ditiones on its springs and on those of the Una, the Daesitiates in the valleys of the Bosna, and the Pirustae at the head-waters of the Drina. These southern tribes in Roman times belonged to the province of Dalmatia and not to that of Pannonia. Nevertheless they are explicitly numbered among the Pannonians and thus belonged to the same ethnic group as the tribes in the northern low-lands.²⁹³

The Celtic Scordisci settled on the confluence of the Sava with the Danube where Singidunum, the ancient name of Belgrade, testifies to the presence of speakers of a Celtic language. They played an important part in the political history of the central Balkans and lost their vigour in interminable wars. When the Romans approached the scene, the Scordisci were no longer able to resist them effectively.²⁹⁴

Celts were also the Latobici in the upper valley of the Sava, the Varciani around Andantonia (today Zagreb), and the Taurisci in the eastern Alps, as well as the Boii, Eravisci, and Hercuniates in what is today western Hungary. They were a part of the large Celtic group that had extended over the Alps through Northern Italy.

A special problem are the traces of Illyrians in Italy. One of the principal topics in this connection is that of the Veneti. They lived in the extreme north-east of Italy, between the Histri and Cisalpine

²⁹³ Cf. Strabo 7.5.3: *ἐθνη δ' ἐστὶ τῶν Παννονίων Βρεῦκοι καὶ Ἀνδιζήτιοι καὶ Διτίωνες καὶ Πειροῦστοι καὶ Μαζαῖοι καὶ Δαισιτιᾶται, ὧν Βάτων ἡγεμόν, καὶ ἄλλα ἀσημότερα μικρά, ἃ διατείνει μέχρι Δαλματίας σχεδὸν δέ τι καὶ Ἀρδιαίων ἰόντι πρὸς νότον.* – After having described the mild climate of the Adriatic coast, Strabo speaks of the harsh weather on the Dinarian highlands and adds that these are held by Pannonians; cf. 7.5.10: *ὁροπέδια δ' ἐστὶ ταῦτα ἃ κατέχουσιν οἱ Παννόνιοι.* [...].

²⁹⁴ Cf. PAPAZOGLU (1969: 209–98); cf. also GAVELA (1951).

Gaul. Because of Herodotus who mentions the Ἰλλυριῶν Ἐνετοί (1.196) they were generally believed to be Illyrians too. But it could be shown that Herodotus distinguishes the Illyrian Veneti from the Adriatic ones.²⁹⁵ There is no historical connection, as far as our sources go, between the Italian Veneti and the Illyrians, and no conclusions can be deduced from such a supposed affiliation.²⁹⁶

Historically much better supported is the presence of Iapods in Umbria. In the *Tabulae Iguvinae* there is a prescription that before the sacrifice begins all foreigners should be removed, among them also Iapods (*Iapuzkum nume*).²⁹⁷

There can be no doubt that Illyrians immigrated to Southern Italy. Daunus, the eponym of the Daunians in Apulia, is said to have been an Illyrian of noble birth who left his country and settled in Italy.²⁹⁸ The Sallentini were a mixture of Cretans and Illyrians²⁹⁹; the Paeligni were immigrants from Illyricum led by their king Volsimus Lucullus.³⁰⁰

It is to be noted that two Illyrian tribes are mentioned in the eastern Alps: the Breuni and the Genauni.³⁰¹ It is not quite clear what exactly is meant by these designations.

The information given by ancient writers can to a certain extent be completed by the results of prehistoric archaeology. In the Neolithic Age several types of cultures co-existed in the north-west of the Balkans. The central Balkanic types of Starčevo in the south and Vinča in the north extended further to the west and reached the eastern part of what today is Slavonia and Bosnia. Another important Neolithic cultural type is that of Butmir in central Bosnia. On the Adriatic coast some sites on the island of

²⁹⁵ Cf. Herodotus 5.9: *ἀγχοῦ Ἐνετῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀδρίῃ.*

²⁹⁶ Cf. KRAHE (1939).

²⁹⁷ Archaeological connections between Spina and the Iapodian territory have recently been discovered. Cf. BIŽIĆ-DRECHSLER (1961).

²⁹⁸ Cf. Paulus Diaconus p. 48.

²⁹⁹ Cf. Festus 484.

³⁰⁰ Cf. Paulus Diaconus p. 278. About Illyrians in South Italy, cf. HELBIG (1876) and PARLANGÈLI (1960). About the Messapians, HERBIG (1927).

³⁰¹ Cf. Strabo 4.6.8: *οἱ δὲ Οὐνδολικοὶ καὶ Νωρικοὶ τὴν ἐκτὸς παρόρριαν κατέχουσι τὸ πλεον μετὰ Βρεῦνων καὶ Γεναύων, ἥδη τοῦτων Ἰλλυριῶν.*

Hvar have been excavated, and a peculiar form of Neolithic culture has been discovered there. Another type has been found in Istria and in a part of what today is Slovenia. All the sites belong to agricultural communities whose idols testify to the cult of a mother-goddess and the worship of female fertility.

About 2000 B.C. all these Neolithic cultures came to a catastrophic end in the cataclysm of a big migration from the east. This was an extensive population shift which originated in the Euro-Asian steppes and penetrated the whole of South-Eastern Europe. In its last phase, this migration reached the North-Western Balkans and destroyed the Neolithic culture of that area. In its course a series of new elements of material culture were brought to the region. The most important ones are: pottery ornamented by strings (*Schurkeramik*), long flint knives, and battle axes. The grave mounds that appear in the interior then link the new-comers with the kurgan-graves of the Euro-Asian steppe.

On this foundation a new Bronze Age culture was formed whose early phases are well illustrated by the cultural types of Vučedol and Kostolac, and by some sites on which a culture of the south German Baden type has been excavated. (The mature Bronze Age basically developed without foreign influences.) There are no traces of migrations. The grave-mounds of Glasinac in eastern Bosnia show a peaceful continuity in the material forms of the Bronze Age culture in the North-Western Balkans. Influences that came from Pannonia were the result of cultural contacts and not of population shifts.

Only at the end of the Bronze Age, new migrations on a large scale began. They originated from the Pannonian low-lands and the Danubian plains, and were directed towards the Aegean and Anatolia. It is the population shift known as the Aegean migration and in Hellas as the Dorian invasion. Other waves from the north-western Balkans reached Italy. The pressure of the Pannonian onslaught made some population groups move over the Adriatic.

On the foundations laid in these massive movements the culture of the Early Iron Age (Hallstatt) began its development. The north-western Balkan is rich in iron ore; the Iron Age there became an age

of prosperity and economic and cultural growth. Extensive trading began. A wealthy aristocracy appeared and with it a major concentration of political power. More primitive communities became organized into tribes which in some instances were quite powerful.

The sites with finds of the Late Iron Age (La-Tène) remain sporadic and are unmistakably connected with the Celtic expansion about 279 B.C.

The cataclysm at the end of the Stone Age probably marks the violent immigration of peoples speaking Indo-European languages. It is the same movement that had brought the Greeks to Hellas and the Thracians to Thrace.

The migrations at the end of the Bronze Age shaped the ethnic and linguistic situation as we grasp it in the historical sources. The full development of these ethnic entities occurs in the Iron Age. It was then that the tribes were formed about which one reads in the works of the ancient authors.³⁰²

Only against this historical and geographical background can the linguistic aspect of the Illyrian complex be correctly viewed and the results of scholarly endeavours to explore it properly evaluated.³⁰³

5.2 THE LANGUAGE

Among the languages of ancient Europe, those spoken in the north-western Balkans and connected in some way or other with the name of the Illyrians early became the object of serious scholarly interest and work. This interest was stimulated not so much by the blank formed on the linguistic map of Europe by the north-east of the Balkans, as by the work on the interpretation of the Messapian inscriptions from Apulia and by the etymological

³⁰² Cf. BENAC (1961, 1964a, 1964b), ČOVIĆ (1964), MARIĆ (1964), GARAŠANIN (1957, 1959, 1964), GABROVEC (1964).

³⁰³ About Illyria and the Illyrians in the broader sense, cf. ZIPPEL (1877), SCHÜTT (1910), FLUSS (1931), ALFÖLDY (1965), KRONASSER (1965), STIPČEVIĆ (1966), *Illirët* (1969). A full bibliography on the subject is given by STIPČEVIĆ (1967).

analysis of the Albanian vocabulary. In the early stage of Illyrian studies these were the main incentives.

Since the early days of humanism a considerable number of inscriptions in an otherwise unknown native language has been found in Apulia. This language, called *Messapian*, was very soon supposed to be that of immigrants from the Illyrian coast (cf. above p. 163), and its names and other lexical elements were interpreted on that basis.³⁰⁴

Etymological investigation of Albanian, once it became clear that this was an independent Indo-European language and autochthonous on the Balkan since antiquity, was bound to concentrate on the ancient antecedents of the contemporary Albanian vocabulary. The search for these antecedents naturally led to the onomastics of the Albanian area in ancient times, and of the whole of the Illyrian provinces. Illyrian onomastics thus became an obligatory ingredient to Albanian etymology.³⁰⁵

Some fundamental inquiries into the origins and affiliations of Italic anthroponymy led to the inclusion of a part of the Illyrian corpus into these studies. Names from the Illyrian provinces were shown to be relevant for the understanding of the personal names in ancient Italy.³⁰⁶

In this field, too, Kretschmer was the first to give a synthetic survey.³⁰⁷ Assuming, to start with, that Albanian is the modern form of the Illyrian language, he came to the conclusion that Illyrian was a satem-language which had changed IE *o* to *a*. In the Messapian inscriptions some elements of correspondence could be found. This was for Kretschmer a further proof for the Illyrian origin of both Messapian and Albanian. The language of the Venetic inscriptions is also Indo-European, but shows preserved *o*, seems to be centum, and has changed *bh* into *f* instead of *b* like

³⁰⁴ The contributions of MOMMSEN, STIER, EBEL, SCHMIDT, DEECKE, RIBBEZZO, and TORP are described and evaluated in KRAHE (1955: 12-4) and RUSSU (1969b: 63-72).

³⁰⁵ The main contributions in this field were those of HAHN (1854), TOMASCHKEK and BUGGE; cf. RUSSU (1969b: 64, 68).

³⁰⁶ PAULI (1891), SCHULZE (1904), RUSSU (1969b: 67, 70).

³⁰⁷ Cf. KRETSCHMER (1896: 244-82).

Albanian and Messapian. The phonemic characteristics of Venetic can be established also in the onomastic material from the north-west of the Illyrian provinces. On the basis of these data Kretschmer posited the existence of two clearly distinct Illyrian languages: one northern including Venetic, the other southern and including Messapian. Albanian was, according to his teaching, a descendent of the latter. These two languages were, all according to Kretschmer, very different as to the sound laws by which they were derived from Indo-European, but nevertheless formed an Illyrian whole. They were connected rather by morphology and vocabulary than by sound development. Kretschmer was not able to establish a borderline between his two Illyrian languages. Both Epirotic and Paeonian were included into his southern Illyrian complex.

"Illyrian" became thus a field of study in its own right which other scholars then began to cultivate systematically.³⁰⁸ The first synthesis with extensive linguistic, mainly onomastic, documentation was given by Jokl, the leading authority of the day on Albanian linguistics.³⁰⁹ Some scholars tried to shed light on Illyrian by including it into broader complexes.³¹⁰ This was also the position of Jokl who considered Illyrian as one of several closely related languages of the ancient Balkans. Today we see clearly that there is no evidence for such an assumption and that, for all we know, there is no reason to postulate an especially close relationship between Illyrian and Thracian.³¹¹

A fresh start was made by H. Krahe. He began a systematic study of the source materials, gave his full attention to the names from the ancient Illyrian countries, and tried to establish a trustworthy corpus of Illyrian forms. His basic assumption was that one language without major differences was spoken in Illyricum and that onomastic elements which appear in the area between the border of Epirus, the Adriatic coast, the Sava, and the Danube

³⁰⁸ Cf. RUSSU (1969b: 69-72) about the contributions of HIRT and SCHRADER.

³⁰⁹ Cf. JOKL (1926).

³¹⁰ Cf. OŠTIR (1923, 1925), BUDIMIR (1925-30, 1929, 1937b, 1937c, 1952b).

³¹¹ Cf. POPOVIĆ (1960-78) and GEORGIEV (1963b).

can safely be regarded as Illyrian. The first result of Krahe's work were two collections of Illyrian geographic and personal names.³¹²

This was the basis of further work. Research now concentrated on onomastic material from Illyricum. The most important work was done by Krahe himself and by A. Mayer, professor of comparative linguistics at the University of Zagreb, who, living in Yugoslavia, had the benefit of ready access to the localities and of an intimate knowledge of their more recent toponymy. The ultimate goal of their endeavours was to discover the phonemic correspondences between Illyrian and the other Indo-European languages and to thus integrate it into comparative philology. The results are presented in syntheses which give a firm basis for further research in the field. Especially valuable is the book of Mayer which in its first tome contains a lexicon of Illyrian lexical items with valuable philological, historical, and topographical information, a true little *Realenzyklopädie* of Illyrian antiquities;³¹³ the second tome presents an etymological dictionary of Illyrian lexical items and a comparative grammar based on it.³¹⁴

Mayer's synthesis is almost exclusively built upon material from Illyricum. Krahe, on the other hand, relies heavily on the Messapian inscriptions. His synthesis was never completed because of a fundamental change of his views in the last years of his life.³¹⁵ In the first tome the sources are collected, and the inscriptions, glosses, and names are presented; historical and topographical information and other *realia* are wanting, but the etymological analysis with an exhaustive bibliography is complete.³¹⁶ The second volume is no continuation of the first; in it two monographs fundamental for the interpretation of the Messapian inscriptions are published.³¹⁷

The most recent manual of Illyrian is that of Russu. It is composed along the same lines as the preceding two. Very useful is its

³¹² Cf. KRAHE (1955-64 2).

³¹³ Cf. KRAHE (1925, 1929).

³¹⁴ Cf. MAYER (1957).

³¹⁵ Cf. MAYER (1959).

³¹⁶ Cf. KRAHE (1964b).

³¹⁷ Cf. KRAHE (1964a).

complete bibliography and the systematic presentation of the history of research in the field.³¹⁸ The lack of clear criteria for determining the probability of the etymologies proposed is the main weakness of the approach followed by these scholars and nowhere is it felt as strongly as in the work of Russu.

We shall try now to illustrate with a few examples the results to which the etymological study of what was believed to be Illyrian has led as well as the uncertainties that remained. The case of the "Illyrian" inscription is particularly instructive in that respect.

In the village of Kalaja Dalmaces near Shkodër in northern Albania a ring had been excavated in a grave. On the ring was an inscription that ran in three lines *ANA OHΘH ICER*.³¹⁹ This was taken to be an autochthonous Illyrian inscription, the only one found in Illyricum. Thanks to Messapian analogies and etymological equations it was not even difficult to give it a most plausible interpretation.

On the Messapian inscriptions *ana* is a word that often precedes the names of female deities (cf. *ana aprodita*, *ana aθana*). Taken that Messapian is an Illyrian idiom displaced to Apulia, this can be a precious lead for the interpretation of the inscription on the ring. The second word *oēθē* is thus marked as the name of a goddess and the whole inscription appears to be votive. In this context the last word is easily identified with IE **iseros* 'sacred' (cf. Gr. *ἱερός* 'manifesting divine power, holy, sacred'). To make it complete, in a Messapian inscription the verbal form *isareti*, presumably 'consecrates', could be identified.³²⁰

Before going further it is important to stress that this interpretation is not a poor, but a brilliant one. It conforms with difficult requirements, and the etymological equations on which it is based are almost evident. No doubt, this is the etymological method at its best. The proposed interpretation has only one fundamental weakness, namely that of being demonstrably wrong. The Bulgarian archaeologist L. Ognenova has shown that the ring itself and the

³¹⁸ Cf. RUSSU (1969b).

³¹⁹ Cf. KRAHE (1955-64 1: 12).

³²⁰ Cf. KRAHE (1928).

archaeological setting in which it has been found were Byzantine and that the inscription, if read from bottom to top, runs in medieval Greek κ(ύρι)ε βοήθη (instead of βοήθει) 'Ἄννα 'Lord, help Anna', a text paralleled on other Byzantine rings.³²¹

The example of this "Illyrian" inscription shows quite clearly how a great master of the art was utterly misled by his one-sided reliance on etymological equations. The penalty for his disregard of the archaeological setting was heavy. The mere possibility of an etymological interpretation, however plausible, gives no security against coincidence by chance, just as it happened in the case of the inscription from Kalaja Dalmaces when read in the wrong direction: from top to bottom.

In most recent times another inscription has been found in Illyricum, and this one certainly does not belong to the domain of Greek or Latin epigraphy. B. Čović excavated near Bugojno in Bosnia a piece of pottery with an ornament that could also be seen as an inscription in some less well-known script.³²² R. Šalabalić proposed to read it as a mixture of Etruscan and Umbrian letters. In the wording itself, if read in that way, Etruscan lexical elements can be recognized; according to archaeological criteria, the inscription is from the sixth or the fifth century B.C.³²³

The interpretation of the inscription on the ring from Kalaja Dalmaces is a welcome initial warning. With it in mind, it will be easier to keep the due reserve while looking at some examples of the etymological approach to forms of supposed Illyrian origin.

Glosses designated explicitly as Illyrian are extremely few. One is given by Hesychius: Δευδάαι: οἱ σάτ[υρ]οι ὑπ' Ἰλλυριῶν. If we accept the current emendation of the manifestly corrupted text, an equation with OI *dhūnoti* 'he shakes' and Gr. θύω 'rage, seethe' presents itself. The Paeonian name of Dionysos Δύαλος probably belongs to the same word family. It seems thus that Illyrian corresponds with *d* to IE *dh*.

³²¹ Cf. OGNEVA (1958, 1959).

³²² Cf. ČOVIĆ (1964b).

³²³ Cf. ŠALABALIĆ (1967).

In the scholion to Odyssey 5.281 we read: οἱ δὲ λέγουσιν Ἰλλυριοὺς ῥινὸν λέγειν τὴν ἀχλύν. Illyrian ῥινός 'mist' has a very interesting correspondence in Albanian *re* (older *ren*) 'cloud'.

We know further the word denoting a beverage popular in central Illyricum. In Ammianus Marcellinus 26.8.2 we read: *est autem sabaia ex ordeo vel frumento in liquorem conversis paupertinus in Illyrico potus*. And Hieronymus in his commentary to Isaiah 7,19 writes *quod genus est potionis ex frugibus aquaque confectum ei vulgo in Dalmatiae Pannoniaeque provinciis gentili barbaroque sermone appellatur sabaium*. Here too an equation with an Indo-European root is possible: **sab-* 'juice' (cf. OI *sabar* 'milk, juice, nectar', OE *sæp* 'juice, soup').

These are the only direct Illyrian glosses. Others are Messapian and thus have only a limited value. An interesting one is: βρένδον δὲ καλοῦσι τὴν ἔλαφον Μεσσάπιοι (Etymologicum Magnum s.v. Βρεντήσιον) and βρέντιον Μεσσαπίους ἢ κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐλάφου (*ibidem*); Messapian βρένδος 'deer' and βρέντιον 'head of a deer' have an interesting correspondence in Albanian *brî* 'horns of a deer'.

Some glosses that have been used for the study of Illyrian are in fact either Epirotic, such as δάξα· θάλασσα. Ἡπειρώται (Hesychius) or Δειπάτυρος· θεὸς παρὰ (Σ)τυμφαίοις (Hesychius), or of a non-Greek phonemic pattern which is supposedly Illyrian; cf. βρά· ἀδελφοί, ὑπὸ Ἡλείων (Hesychius), which is interpreted as a short form of IE **bhrātēr* (cf. OI *bhrātā*, Lat. *frāter*, Goth. *broþar* and OCS *bratrъ*, all 'brother'). This un-Greek word in northwestern Eleian has been explained as an Illyrian loan.

Whatever the value of these glosses and of the etymological equations they invite, it is clear that on their basis no comprehensive study of Illyrian historical phonology is possible. The only possibility, if any, to arrive at such a goal is to include into etymological research the names that are directly or indirectly attested in the ancient Illyricum. This material is comparatively rich but the meanings of the forms even in the most favorable cases remain conjectural and normally one has to resort to more or less arbitrary guesses. The probabilistic foundations of any etymological combination are under such circumstances much weaker, the probability of

chance similarities much higher. Working with onomastic material one is permanently in the situation illustrated by the interpretation of the inscription on the ring from Kalaja Dalmaçes.

In some favourable cases the form is so long and the correspondences of its phonemes with those of other Indo-European languages so complete that the probability of pure chance is really reduced, if not excluded. This is the case with the name *Vescleves* that repeatedly appears on inscriptions from Liburnia. It invites to an equation with IE **wesu-klewes* 'whose fame is good' (cf. OI *Vasuśravas*).

Yet, even in such almost evident cases it is necessary to maintain a reserve. On an inscription from the Adriatic island of Brattia one reads the name *Veselia Felicetas*. On the basis of the assumption that the second name translates the first, *Veselia* has been equated with OCS *veselъ* 'gay'. This etymology is certainly a good one, and the length of the chain of phonemic correspondences reduces the probability of their being due to chance. Illyrian *Veselia* has therefore been included even in etymological dictionaries. All the same, extraetymological data, *realia* again, show that this equation is wrong. This can be demonstrated by the study of the areal distribution of onomastic elements: *Veselia* must be interpreted as a vulgar form of the Latin nomen gentile *Visellia* which in Dalmatia belongs to immigrants from Italy.³²⁴

In the light of this experience one is less satisfied with the generally well-received interpretation of *P. Domatius P.f. Tergitio negotiator* on an inscription from Scarbantia in Pannonia. The cognomen *Tergitio* is usually explained as the Illyrian word for *negotiator* 'merchant' and etymologically connected with Alb. *trëgë* 'market', and OCS *trъgъ* 'market'. With the help of this personal name one can then also explain the toponym *Tergeste* (today Trieste) which seems to mean 'market place'. Against this etymology nothing can be said except that that of *Veselia* was not worse.

³²⁴ Cf. KALLERIS (1954: 188), and KATIČIĆ (1961b).

In other cases, toponyms seem to be matched by translations in more recent denominations of the same locality. Thus *Birziminium* is the name of a town later known as *Podgorica* 'which is under a hillock'. The medieval citadel of Podgorica is located on a hillock over the confluence of the Ribnica with the Morača. It can therefore be assumed that *Birziminium* means 'hillock' and then the name can be derived from IE **bhṛgh-* 'high' (cf. OI *bṛhant-* 'high', Avest. *bərəz-* 'high', Germ. *Berg* 'mountain', OCS *brěgъ* 'mountain, bank'). This etymology presupposes the sound development of a satem-language for Illyrian.

A station to the north of Epidaurum was called *Asamum*. Topographically, it corresponds with a locality in medieval sources called *Lapida* (1272), today Croatian *Lapad*. If the medieval Latin name is a translation of the older one, it becomes very probable that the ancient name should be equated with OI *aśman* 'stone', Lith. *ašmuo* 'cutting-edge', and ON *hamarr* 'cliff, hammer'.

But one has to be very cautious when assuming such indirect translations. An etymological explanation of *Delminium*, the name of the ancient capital of the Delmatae, has been proposed by connecting it with the Albanian words *dele/delme* 'sheep'. As an indication in that direction, the fact has been repeatedly stressed that Strabo calls Delminium *ἡ πεδῖον μηλόβοτον* 'a pasturage for sheep'. But if one looks at it more closely, Strabo does not say that the plain of Delminium was a pasturage of sheep, but that it was made one by Nasica.³²⁵ And *μηλόβοτον ποιεῖν* 'make a pasturage of sheep' is a common expression in Greek literature with the meaning of 'devastate'. Strabo says thus only that Nasica had reduced the population of the town and devastated the plain. This is not in the least a confirmation of the etymological explanation with the Albanian words.³²⁶

Many of the proposed equations are nothing but mere possibilities. Such are:

³²⁵ Cf. Strabo 7.5.5: *Δέλμιον δὲ μεγάλη πόλις ἦς ἐπώνυμον τὸ ἔθνος, μικρὰν δ' ἐποίησε Νασικᾶς καὶ τὸ πεδῖον μηλόβοτον διὰ τὴν πλεονεξίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων.*

³²⁶ Cf. KATIČIĆ (1965b).

mons Bulsinus : IE *bh₁k-/bh₁ǵ-; cf. Gr. φάλαγξ 'rib, part of a ship', OHGerm. *balko* 'beam'

Anderva, Δερβανοί : IE *derv-; cf. OCS *drěvo* 'tree'

Ἀνδιζήτες, Διζήρος : IE *digh-; cf. OPers. *didā* 'fortress', Gr. τεῖχος 'wall'

insula in Savo Metubarbis, amnicarum maxima : IE *metu-borb-; cf.: Gr. μετά, Goth. *miþ*, both 'with'; Alb. *mjet* 'till' and Gr. βόρβορος 'mire, filth'; OCS *bara*, Alb. *berrák*, both 'marsh'; (the Illyrian name would then mean 'between the marshes')

Nedinum : IE *ned-; cf. OI *nadas* 'roarer'

Naro : IE *nor-; cf. Lith. *nāras* 'diving duck', Russ. *norá* 'hole', SCr. *po-nor* 'abyss'

Oseriates : IE *agher-; cf. Russ. *ozero* 'lake', Gr. Ἀχέρων (the name of a lake)

lacus Pelso : IE *pels-; cf. Czech *pleso* 'deep place on a river, lake'

Σκενόβαρδος : IE *skeno-bhardhos; cf. OHG *scīnan* 'shine' and Engl. *beard*

On the whole, the Illyrian etymologies that could be proposed do not reach the standard of the Thracian ones. Still, at least the generally held view that the north-western Balkans already in ancient times belonged to the Indo-European linguistic area seems to be confirmed and justified. There are many plausible Indo-European etymologies and it is hardly probable that all are wrong, but it has thus far proved impossible to derive from this etymological material a dependable comparative grammar.

The central problem here is that of the Indo-European gutturals. It has remained controversial whether Illyrian was a centum- or a satem-language. In the Illyrian material there are centum and satem etymologies and it is not easy to decide which ones are to be accepted as decisive. A fundamental centum etymology is that of *Vescleves*. Other examples are: *Agruvium*, Ἀγρων, *Argyrunum*, *Argyas*, *Peucetii*, *Rega*, *Regontius*, *Cornuinus*; *Gentius* and *Genusus* also suggest centum etymologies. On the other hand there are

satem etymologies such as *Asamum*, *Birziminium*, Ἀνδιζήτες, Διζήρος, *Bulsinus*, and *Oseriates*. Many other satem etymologies have been proposed, but their value is very doubtful. The names *Dasimius* and *Dasumius* can be derived from IE *dek₁m 'ten' (cf. Lat. *decem*); *Verzo*, *Versus* from IE *werǵ- 'work' (cf. Gr. Ἔργον 'work'); *mons Massarum* from IE *m_oǵ- 'big' (cf. Lat. *magnus* 'big').

There is nothing to give a substantial and trustworthy lead. Many of the centum etymologies are from the north-west (*Vescleves*, *Argyrunum*, *Peucetii*, *Rega*, *Regontius*, *Cornuinus*) and can thus be regarded as elements belonging to the Venetic linguistic complex.³²⁷ Venetic was, as we know from the inscriptions, a centum language. The onomastic elements with plausible centum etymologies may thus belong to it.

In Messapian the situation is not clear. There are etymologies of both kinds: *barzidihi* can be connected with IE *bherǵh- 'high', and *vaikanetaos* with IE *woikō- 'house' (cf. Gr. οἶκος 'house'). Mess. *argorian* 'silver' may easily be a Greek loan (ἄργύριον). Thus one cannot decide whether to regard Messapian as a centum or as a satem language.³²⁸

The centum/satem question remains thus undecided and controversial for the main area of the ancient Illyricum. There are scholars who favour the centum solution (Hirt, Krahe, Whatmough, Barić) and others who believe that Illyrian was a satem-language (Ribezzo, Jokl, Mayer, Russu). Opinion stands here against opinion.³²⁹ Some scholars believe that the traces of satem etymologies in the toponymy of the ancient north-western Balkans must be explained as the rests of a Thracian substratum in that area.³³⁰

³²⁷ A complete edition of the Venetic inscriptions with an exhaustive manual of this language has been published in PELLEGRINI – PROSDOCIMI (1967). About Venetic anthroponymy, cf. UNTERMANN (1961).

³²⁸ A complete edition of the Messapian inscriptions with an exhaustive commentary has been published in PARLANGÈLI (1960a); for a chronology of the script and the inscriptions, cf. SIMONE (1964); for Messapian anthroponymy, cf. UNTERMANN (1964); for Messapian toponymy, cf. KRAHE (1929–37, 1939–43).

³²⁹ In addition to the manuals quoted on p. 168, cf. BARIĆ (1954: 9–12).

³³⁰ Cf. PATSCH (1907).

In the west, there is only one toponym to be derived with certainty from Thracian: this is Θερμίδαυα in Dalmatia; but even this may be a corruption in the text of Ptolemy.³³¹ If not, this toponym belongs to a relatively recent group of Daco-Mysian settlers.³³² In general, there is no reason to conclude from the possibilities of satem etymologies that Thracians lived in the north-western Balkans.

Some interesting derivational devices have been established in the Illyrian area. They appear clearly in the formation of ethnica from toponyms. Characteristic are the suffixes in *-t-* and *-st-*. Cf.:

<i>Apsoros</i>	: <i>Apsortes</i>	<i>Burnum</i>	: <i>Burnistae</i>
<i>Albona</i>	: <i>Alutae</i>	<i>Iader</i>	: <i>Iadestini</i>
<i>Curicum</i>	: <i>Curictae</i>	<i>Nerate</i>	: <i>Narestini</i>
<i>Delminium</i>	: <i>Delmatae</i>	<i>Onaeum</i>	: <i>Onastini</i>
<i>Flanona</i>	: <i>Flanates</i>	<i>Splonum</i>	: <i>Splonistae</i>
<i>Nedinum</i>	: <i>Neditae</i>		
<i>Rider</i>	: <i>Riditae</i>		
<i>Tariona</i>	: <i>Tariotae</i>		

There can be no doubt that these are pieces of native morphology preserved in the Latinized forms of the toponyms and the ethnica.

Illyrian was thus thought of as an undivided language spoken in the whole of Illyricum with possible Venetic influences in the north-west. But for all the systematic etymological research, this language has remained a shadowy entity among the members of the Indo-European family. Although Illyrian data have begun to make their appearance in etymological dictionaries, the real content of the label *Illyrian* still is imprecise to the extreme.

With so many fundamental problems of its comparative grammar still unsolved and controversial, *Illyrian* was introduced as a label supposedly contributing to the elucidation of European linguistic prehistory. Whatever onomastic elements in central and western

³³¹ Cf. MAYER (1967: 337).

³³² Cf. GEORGIEV (1958c: 93).

Europe did not belong to one of the known Indo-European language groups, were regarded as a survival of an Illyrian substratum if only some analogy with the onomastics of Illyricum could be established. The Illyrian area began thus to grow dramatically as greater time-depth was reached. Beginning with the southern shore of the Baltic, the supposed prehistoric Illyrian area extended over Germany, France, the Danubian countries, and the whole of the Balkans to Anatolia, the Iberian peninsula, and the British isles.³³³

This hypothetical extension of the Illyrian area was in itself a sort of *reductio ad absurdum*. The reaction against such panillyrism was immediate and strong.³³⁴ It became apparent that the established analogies, mostly in the names of rivers and creeks, could not possibly characterize one single Indo-European language. The data of an Illyrian substratum in almost the whole of Europe were thus reinterpreted as the vestiges of an undivided Old European hydronymy to whose area Illyricum also belonged.³³⁵ According to the last development of this theory, the Old-European hydronymy is just simply Indo-European. Outside of Europe, Indo-European hydronymy has been lost.³³⁶

In the course of the Old European researches it has also become obvious that the whole of Illyricum cannot be regarded as one linguistic area. Analogies in hydronymy with the Baltic can for instance, be established only for the northern Adriatic. Where linguistic unity was unquestioningly assumed, a certain degree of linguistic variety has to be reckoned with.³³⁷ Thus etymological research in the Illyrian area did not even lead to the solution of the most fundamental questions.³³⁸ This does not mean, of course, that useful contributions cannot be made in this field.³³⁹

³³³ Cf. POKORNY (1938), BORGEAUD (1943), also KRAHE (1937a, 1940), SCHWYZER (1939: 65-7).

³³⁴ Cf. PISANI (1937).

³³⁵ Cf. KRAHE (1954, 1963, 1964).

³³⁶ Cf. SCHMID (1968).

³³⁷ Cf. KRAHE (1957, 1959).

³³⁸ Cf. KRONASSER (1962).

³³⁹ Cf. POPOVIĆ (1959), DURIDANOV (1963), DEVOTO (1966), HARMATTA (1967), ZAIMOV (1969). – Interesting are also the endeavours of PAVLOVIĆ (1965, 1968,

5.3 RECENT STUDIES IN "ILLYRIAN" ANTHROPONYMY

In dealing with the autochthonous language material from the north-west of the ancient Balkans, the etymological method is not very promising. That much at least could be shown in the preceding section. The more important are the attempts to acquire some knowledge about the native population of the Illyrian provinces and about their language through a careful onomastic study of the recorded personal names.

An important and promising start was made by D. Rendić-Miočević, professor of archaeology at the University of Zagreb and specialist in epigraphy. In discovering new inscriptions and correcting the reading of old ones he provided a substantial contribution to the source materials for the study of Illyrian anthroponymy.³⁴⁰ In a series of studies he tried to discover the social and cultural setting of the native personal names from the ancient Greek and Latin inscriptions, to disentangle the complex influence of autochthonous traditions and foreign influences and to show how social growth and integration into the ancient, especially into the Roman world, effected itself on the onomastic level.³⁴¹

The development of onomastic formulas is in this connection of paramount importance. New insights were gained also into the process of Romanization in that part of the Empire. This is of basic importance since most of our documents of native onomastic and linguistic elements are also documents of Romanization.³⁴² Even

1969) to reach conclusions about ancient linguistic relations in the north-west of the Balkans from characteristic modern correspondences in the vocabulary and the onomastics of the area. It is, however, difficult to know which ones of such correspondences continue some traits of the ancient substratum and which do not.

³⁴⁰ Cf. RENDIĆ-MIOČEVIĆ (1951b, 1953). An exhaustive catalogue of personal names for the province of Dalmatia has been published in ALFÖLDY (1969); for Pannonia in MÓCSY (1959) and BARKÓCZI (1964).

³⁴¹ Cf. RENDIĆ-MIOČEVIĆ (1948, 1951a, 1952, 1956, 1960-64, 1963). About the methodology cf. ŠAŠEL (1964).

³⁴² Cf. RENDIĆ-MIOČEVIĆ (1966); cf. in that connection also SUIĆ (1966a, 1966b), DEGMEDŽIĆ (1966), PAŠALIĆ (1966), BAJEC (1929).

some parallels with, and influences on the anthroponymy of, early medieval Croatia could be established.³⁴³

One observation made in the course of these researches had important consequences for our understanding of the linguistic situation in the north-west of the ancient Balkans. It could be shown that the native anthroponymy of the Liburnian territory has its own characteristic inventory of names and a special type of semi-Romanized onomastic formula.³⁴⁴ Such names that recur characteristically in Liburnia are: *Aetor*, *Aplus*, *Ceunus*, *Darmocus*, *Oeplus*, *Oia*, *Opiavus*, *Opia*, *Oplus*, *Oplica*, *Raecus*, *Suioca*, *Vadicus*, *Vescleves*, *Veturia*, *Viniocus*, *Volso*, *Voltissa*. These names are concentrated on the Liburnian territory whereas elsewhere in Illyricum there are but a few random records in places neighbouring on Liburnia.

This discovery was the end of the concept of an undivided "Illyrian" anthroponymy. The Liburnian anthroponymy proved soon to be only one part of a much larger onomastic complex which extended also to Histrian and Venetic anthroponymy and reached even the valleys of the eastern Alps.³⁴⁵ This onomastic system we shall call NORTH-ADRIATIC.

A similar concentration of the areal distribution of onomastic elements could be established for the Illyrian south-east. The author of this survey made the observation that some of the names connected with the south-east do not appear in the central regions where many native names are recorded. After the publication of the first paper on this subject the inscriptions of a necropolis near Dyrrachium became known, and the names were to a remarkable extent exactly those which one would expect as characteristic for the south-east.³⁴⁶ Such names that recur characteristically in the south-east are: *Annaeus*, *Bardylis*, *Kalas*, *Cilles*, *Clevatus*, *Epicadus*,

³⁴³ Cf. RENDIĆ-MIOČEVIĆ (1949). About the Slavization of the north-western Balkans, cf. *Simpozijum* (1968), especially BARIŠIĆ (1968), GRAFENAUER (1968), BROZOVIĆ (1968).

³⁴⁴ Cf. RENDIĆ-MIOČEVIĆ (1955).

³⁴⁵ Cf. UNTERMANN (1961).

³⁴⁶ Cf. KATIČIĆ (1962b, 1964a, 1964c).

Etleva, Etuta, Ettritius, Gentius, Glavus, Grabon, Momunius, Pinnes, Plassus, Pleuratus, Skerdilaëdas, Temus, Teutana, Verzo, Zanatis. This onomastic system belongs to the territory of the ancient Illyrian state and can therefore properly be called ILLYRIAN.

In the central region a third type of anthroponymy could be detected. Its area encompasses the territory of the Delmatae, that of the Iapods, and, in a broader sense, the country of the Pannonian tribes to the south as well as to the north of the Sava. Characteristic names are: *Anna, Andes, Aplis, Aplo, Apludus, Baezus, Baezo, Baracio, Barcinus, Baurea, Bennus, Beuzas, Buzetius, Biso, Bubant-, Carpius, Carvius, Cato, Cursulavia, Dasant-, Dasto, Diteius, Dito, Germanus, Gresia, Lavius, Lavo, Paius, Paio, Panes, Panentius, Panico, Pant-, Panto, Pinent-, Pinsus, Pladomenus, Plahe, Planus, Platino, Prevo, Samuntius, Samuntio, Scaeva, Scenobarbus, Scenocalus, Seius, Seio, Sinus, Stataria, Staticus, Stennas, Stennato, Suttis, Testimos, Testo, Tizius, Tritanus, Tritano, Tritaneria, Tudania, Varro, Vendes, Vendo.*

Characteristic of this central region is also the formation of feminines in *-o/-ōnis* (cf. *Aplis* (m.) : *Aplo* (f.); *Baezus* (m.) : *Baezo* (f.); *Dasant-* (m.) : *Dasto* (f.); *Ditus* (m.) : *Dito* (f.); *Paius* (m.) : *Paio* (f.); *Vendes* (m.) : *Vendo* (f.); etc.). This anthroponymic type is well recorded and coherent. It can be neatly distinguished from both the Liburnian and the Illyrian type with their characteristic name inventories.³⁴⁷

In the northern part of this central area, on the territory of the Pannonian tribes south of the Sava, ancient inscriptions are scarce. Only a few native names have been recorded, but as far as we can judge, they belong to the same onomastic type as those of the central region. It probably is not just due to chance that some of the very characteristic names of the Delmatae have not yet been found on the inscriptions of the northern region and that no feminine in *-o/-ōnis* has been recorded there.³⁴⁸

We know too little about this region to draw any final conclusions. But so far one can contend confidently that the anthroponymy

³⁴⁷ Cf. KATIČIĆ (1963, 1964a, 1964c).

³⁴⁸ Cf. KATIČIĆ (1965a).

of the Pannonian tribes belongs to the same general type as that of the Delmatae and of the Iapods. This onomastic complex we may call DELMATO-PANNONIAN.

The anthroponymy of the Pannonian tribes north of the Sava is somewhat better known. The characteristic name here is *Liccaius*. It is recorded also on the Pannonian territory south of the river. Other names like *Dasent-*, *Dasius*, *Dasmenus*, *Scenobarvus*, and *Scenus* show that this anthroponymy belongs to the same Delmato-Pannonian onomastic system.³⁴⁹

A special problem is posed by the anthroponymy of the Dardanian territory. Some of the native names recorded there belong to the Illyrian (*Momunius, Etuta, Epicadus, Scerulaedus*), some others belong to the Delmato-Pannonian system (*Andia, Anna, Dasius, Plannius*). In eastern Dardania the native names are predominantly Thracian. It seems that in the west of Dardania an originally Illyrian anthroponymy was superseded by a Delmato-Pannonian stratum.³⁵⁰

In the north-western Balkans one must expect also some traces of Celtic anthroponymy. Paradoxically the native names of the Celtic Scordisci are distinctly Pannonian. Before the time of the preserved inscriptions this powerful Celtic tribe had been onomastically assimilated to the native Pannonian population. Some traces of Celtic anthroponymy belonging to the Scordisci can perhaps be discerned on inscriptions from the Drina. A Celtic element was, quite naturally, sought also in the anthroponymy of the Iapods, but with less success. Names with Celtic affiliations on the Iapodic territory are few and it is impossible to discern whether they form part of the native onomastics or are imported from the neighbouring Celtic area.³⁵¹

Celtic anthroponymy covers almost without disruption the eastern Alps in the provinces of Noricum and Pannonia and also the Pannonian low-lands north of the Drava. This is the territory held by the tribes of the Taurisci with the Latobici and of the Boii

³⁴⁹ Cf. KATIČIĆ (1968c).

³⁵⁰ Cf. KATIČIĆ (1964c), PAPAZOGLU (1964; 1969: 168–89).

³⁵¹ Cf. ALFÖLDY (1964, 1969), KATIČIĆ (1965a); cf. also ŽGANJER (1952).

with the Eravisci and the Hercuniates. Only the Azali at the knee of the Danube in the extreme north-east of Pannonia have Pannonian names again. The Celtic onomastic system is the same over almost the entire large area described above. Characteristic names are: *Adnamatus, Assedomarus, Ato, Auscus, Bardo, Bella, Boniatius, Calendinus, Catullus, Comatus, Couso, Deuso, Diastumarus, Dubna, Eppius, Iantumarus, Leucimarus, Loucita, Magemarus, Maro, Medus, Mogio, Nemeto, Nertomarus, Nonnus, Nundinus, Ressatus, Secconius, Suadra, Tatucus, Titio, Trogimarus, Tutor, Vepo, Vindo.*

This anthroponymy is closely related to that of other Celtic regions, such as Gaul, Britain, Northern Italy, and some parts of the Iberian peninsula. All the same, this eastern Celtic anthroponymy, we may call it NORIC, has to a certain extent a specific name inventory of its own. The more important then is the fact that on one site in Upper Pannonia, in Ig near Emona, there is a significantly low percentage of specifically Noric onomastic elements and a relatively high percentage of specifically non-Noric Celtic names, such as: *Aiconus, Broccus, Ecco, Emo, Eppo, Exouna, Moiota, Mosso, Otto, Ovis, Secco, Talsus, Tetta.* This seems to be a trace of another Celtic onomastic stratum older than the Noric one.³⁵²

The native names recorded on the inscriptions from Ig are important in still another respect. Many of them are not Celtic at all but belong to the North-Adriatic onomastic system. In the anthroponymy of Ig these names are about as frequent as the Celtic ones, and it is thus impossible to decide by purely quantitative criteria which of them originally belong to the onomastic system of Ig and which entered it under foreign influences.

But there is one essential difference between the Celtic and the North-Adriatic names in the anthroponymy of ancient Ig. The latter are much more integrated into derivational families than the former. Many North-Adriatic names are derived from the same stems by different devices: *Bucca, Buccicu, Buco, Buccio, Buccirega; Enna, Ennia, Enno, Enico, Enignus, Eninna; Laso, Lasaiu, Lascontia;*

³⁵² Cf. KATIČIĆ (1966a).

Voltanis, Voltarenis, Voltaron-, Voltaront-, Voltaronitia, Voltarotia, Voltia, Voltielus, Voltilius, Voltognas, Voltrex, Voltuparis. This means that the North-Adriatic names are better integrated into the onomastic system of ancient Ig and can therefore be regarded as its original component.³⁵³

Recent research in the field of anthroponomy has thus discovered a variety of onomastic systems that is quite in contrast with the views prevailing traditionally in Illyrian studies. The importance of these new insights for the understanding of the ethnic and linguistic situation is evident. Onomastic systems are no languages and cannot therefore be automatically equated with them, but a certain correlation between both can be expected to exist, especially in primitive society where no superethnic cultural structures were formed.

With all due caution we can thus contend that in the north-west of the ancient Balkans there existed, more probably than not, also an ethnic and linguistic variety.

One ethnic and, for all we know, also a linguistic entity were the LIBURNIANS. One is tempted to believe that their language was related to Venetic. The occurrence of *f* in the names of this region seems to support such a hypothesis. The anthroponymy in itself does not grant us evidence enough for a definite contention in that respect.³⁵⁴

Another ethnic group we may call PANNONIAN, although on the strength of anthroponymy it can be said to encompass not only the Pannonian tribes but also the Iapods and the Delmatae. This ethnic entity is clearly different from the Illyrians in the south-east and it is quite possible that its language was different from the Illyrian one. Whether Illyrian and Pannonian were in fact two languages or a single one, which may be called ILLYRIAN, we are at present unable to tell. Nevertheless we must reckon with the possibility of their being two. We cannot regard them as one Illyrian language

³⁵³ Cf. KATIČIĆ (1968a).

³⁵⁴ Cf. UNTERMANN (1970).

unless such a hypothesis is substantiated with some evidence from new linguistic data.³⁵⁵

The Scordisci, so it seems, lost their Gallic language quite early and began to speak Pannonian. In the upper valley of the Sava and in the low-lands between the Drava and the Danube, Gallic was spoken till late Antiquity.

5.4 THE ORIGIN OF ALBANIAN

Albanian is an Indo-European satem-language forming a group of its own, just as Greek and Armenian do. If Pedersen is right in postulating his law about the assibilation of labio-velars before palatal vowels in Albanian, it is not really a satem-language but one which assibilates the palatal stops while keeping all three rows of the gutturals distinct.³⁵⁶ This issue is still controversial although the specialists tend to accept Pedersen's law.

All written documents of Albanian are recent, the oldest date from the fifteenth century A.D. The people itself appears in the historical sources only in the Middle Ages. So there is no direct tradition about the older stages of this Indo-European language. And yet we know that it is the continuation of a language spoken in the Balkans already in ancient times. This has been proved by the fact that there are Ancient Greek loan words in Albanian (cf. Alb. *mokëne* 'mill-stone' from Gr. *μαχανά* 'machine'; Alb. *pjepën* 'melon' from Gr. *πέπων* 'melon'; Alb. *shpellë* 'cave' from Gr. *σπήλαιον* 'cave'; *bletë* 'bee' from Gr. *μέλιττα* 'bee'; and other words).³⁵⁷

In the historical sources there is no mention of an Albanian migration. It is therefore natural to assume that Albanian was

³⁵⁵ Cf. KATIČIĆ (1968b); cf. also ALFÖLDY (1964, 1969). A direct testimony to the Pannonian linguistic unit is given by Hieronymus, *Comm. in Iasiam* 7.9: *vulgo in Dalmatiae Pannoniaeque provinciis gentili barbaroque sermone appellatur sabaium*. This is not the *lingua Pannonica* of Tacitus, *Germania* 43. Cf. MÓCSY (1969).

³⁵⁶ Cf. p. 63; cf. also PEDERSEN (1900).

³⁵⁷ Cf. THUMB (1909), BARIĆ (1959: 32), ÇABEJ (1964: 83–7).

since ancient times spoken in more or less the same area in which it is now. This area coincides roughly with the modern state of Albania and extends over the border into Yugoslav and Greek territory. There are Albanian-speaking groups in Greek Epirus, in the western part of the Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and in the east of Montenegro. In Kosovo, an autonomous province of the Yugoslav Republic of Serbia, the population is predominantly Albanian. This area, occupied today by speakers of Albanian, lies almost completely within ancient Illyrian territory. In the east it extends to close to the ancient border between Illyria and Thrace; in the south it occupies part of the Paeonian, Macedonian, and Epirotic territory (whatever the linguistic affiliation of these peoples in antiquity might have been).

This being so, it is normal and natural to regard Albanian as a modern descendant of the Illyrian language. The fact that in ancient Illyricum we must reckon now with a linguistic variety has no consequences in this matter since the Albanian area coincides only with the territory that was Illyrian in the strict sense.

All the same the natural assumption of an Illyrian descent of Albanian has been challenged and some scholars think it more likely that Albanian continues Thracian. The issue has been hotly debated and is still controversial.

Those scholars who believe Illyrian to be a centum-language had, of course, to deny the Illyrian descent of Albanian; a Thracian affiliation for them was the easiest solution.³⁵⁸ But there is no sufficient reason for such a conclusion because it is far from sure that Illyrian, especially the language of the people with the Illyrian onomastic system, actually was a centum language. But even if it was, this could not decide the present controversy since there are reasons to believe that in Albanian the assibilation of the palatal stops was very late, in part not before the Middle Ages.³⁵⁹

Other linguistic arguments for a Thracian affiliation of Albanian are more important. The principal one is that of toponyms. Some

³⁵⁸ Cf. PAULI (1891: 200), HIRT (1898: 181–; 1905–07: 140–, 150–, 604–).

³⁵⁹ Cf. CIMOCHOWSKI (1958: 43) and ÇABEJ (1964: 75).

scholars contend that the ancient toponyms of Albania did not undergo the Albanian sound changes while others in the central Balkans did. Instead, the toponyms of Albania rather show traces of Romance and Slavic mediation. Ancient *Scodra* could not become Alb. *Shkodër* since initial *sk-* changed to *h-* in Albanian. Also *Dyrrachium* could become Alb. *Durrës* only through the mediation of Slav. *Dŕačъ* since Latin *-ky-* yields Albanian *-q-* and Slav. *-č-*, whereas this latter has gone through the Albanian development *tš > ts > s*. The Albanian hydronym *Cem* from ancient *Cinua* presupposes the Slavic palatalization.

On the other hand *Niš* from *Ναῖσός*, *Štip* from *Ἀστῖβος*, *Šar* from *Scardus*, and *Ohrid* from *Lychnidus* presuppose the sound development characteristic for Albanian. From there some scholars conclude that the original Albanian area was more to the east, in the interior of the Balkans, and not in the maritime regions of present-day Albania. The almost complete lack of a native Albanian terminology for sea-faring and fishing seems to confirm this: Alb. *gjemí* 'ship' is of Turkish, *lundër* 'boat' is of Latin, *varkë* 'barque' is of Modern Greek, *lopatë* 'oar' is of Slavic, *peshk* 'fish' and *natoj* 'swim' are of Latin origin.³⁶⁰

The answer to this is that in judging whether a sound change is originally Albanian or not, chronological differences must be taken into consideration. The change of initial *sk-* to *h-* is very old in Albanian, perhaps even pre-Balkan, and it is no wonder if some ancient Balkanic toponyms do not conform to it. Some toponyms came to Albanian through Romance or Slavic mediation or even through both. But on the main Albanian names such as *Lesh*, *Drisht*, *Kunavja*, *Drin*, *Buenë*, *Mat*, and *Ishm* can be derived from their ancient forms *Lissus*, *Drivastum*, *Candavia*, *Drinus*, *Barbanna*, *Mathis*, and *Isamnus* only by Albanian sound changes, and by no others. One has only to suppose an initial accentuation in Illyrian: *Dýrrachium*, *Ísamnus*, *Drívastum* (cf. Messapian *Brúndisium > Brindisi*).³⁶¹

³⁶⁰ Cf. WEIGAND (1927), POPOVIĆ (1958; 1960: 79).

³⁶¹ Cf. ÇABEJ (1958: 59).

The maritime and piscatorial terminology is not so completely foreign as the linguists were prone to think under the impact of the first impression.³⁶² It must be taken into consideration that the cities on the coast were probably romanized first, and that the Modern Albanian language is probably the descendant of dialects originally spoken in the hills.³⁶³

It has been said furthermore that, linguistically, Albanian corresponds more to Thracian than to Illyrian.³⁶⁴ Such a contention cannot be well founded because we know too little about both Thracian and Illyrian. And for the few preserved Illyrian glosses it is remarkably easy to find Albanian correspondences.

The existence of many correspondences between Rumanian and Albanian has also been thought of as an argument for the Thracian origin of the latter.³⁶⁵ But this again cannot decide the question since neither the original area of Rumanian nor the nature of the contacts that were the cause of the correspondences between these languages are known. The question thus remains open.

These correspondences seem to confirm the belief that Albanian is a descendant of Daco-Mysian. This hypothesis is based on the identical comparative phonologies of the two languages.³⁶⁶ But the comparative phonology of Daco-Mysian is so conjectural that no far-reaching conclusions should be drawn from it.

It is quite possible that there was a transfer of language from the mountains of the interior to the Albanian coast, which probably had been romanized to a great extent. But there is no reason to assume any large-scale migration, and even for Dardania and Paeonia, if the cradle of Albanian is to be sought there, we cannot be sure that they were Thracian in late antiquity.³⁶⁷

Nothing in the nature of a proof has been presented so far for the Thracian origin of Albanian, only a cumulation of indications

³⁶² Cf. ÇABEJ (1964: 76).

³⁶³ Cf. CIMOCHOWSKI (1958: 38).

³⁶⁴ Cf. BARIĆ (1954: 1-48), POPOVIĆ (1960: 81-2), DEČEV (1960: 190-8).

³⁶⁵ Cf. BARIĆ (1954: 27-34).

³⁶⁶ Cf. GEORGIEV (1957b: 73-4).

³⁶⁷ Cf. JOKL (1924) and PISANI (1964).

which, without deciding the question, prevent us from rejecting the Thracian hypothesis outright. The only thing one can do is to keep an open mind while remembering that in this controversy the burden of proof is with those who deny the Illyrian descent of Albanian.³⁶⁸

³⁶⁸ Cf. ČABEJ (1970).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alessio, G.
1954 *Le lingue indeuropee nell'ambiente mediterraneo* (Bari: Adriatica editrice).
- Alföldy, G.
1964 "Die Namengebung der Urbevölkerung in der römischen Provinz Dalmatia", *BNF* 15: 55–104.
1965 *Bevölkerung und Gesellschaft der römischen Provinz Dalmatien* (Budapest: Akadémiai kiadó).
1969 *Die Personennamen der römischen Provinz Dalmatia* (= *BNF Beiheft* 4) (Heidelberg: Winter).
- Aly, W.
1909 "Karer und Leleger", *Philologus* 68: 428–44.
- Bajec, A.
1929 "Romanizacija in jezik rimskih provinc Norika ter obeh Panonij" [Romanization and the language of the Roman provinces Noricum and both Pannonias], *Razprave Znanstvenega društva za humanistične vede* 4: 53–66.
- Barić, H.
1921 "Po ilirskim tragovima" [On Illyrian traces], *JslF* 2: 50–60.
1926 "Miscellen", *Archiv za arbanasku starinu, jezik i etnologiju* 3: 213–21.
1948 "Ilirske jezične studije" [Illyrian linguistic studies], *RadJA* 272: 5–56.
1954 *Lingvističke studije* (= *Djela Naučnog društva NR Bosne i Hercegovine* 1) (Sarajevo: Beogradski grafički zavode Beograd).
1956 "Venetisch-Germanisches und Illyrisch-Germanisches", *Godišnjak Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja Akademije Bosne i Hercegovine* (= *GABiH*) 1: 272–5.
1959 *Istorija arbanaškog jezika* [History of the Albanian language] (= *Djela Naučnog društva NR Bosne i Hercegovine* 12) (Sarajevo: Beogradski grafički zavode Beograd).
1961a "Thrakisches", *GABiH* 2: 13–20.

- 1961b "Albanische und albanisch-rumänische Wortstudien", *GABiH* 2: 21-45.
- Barišić, F.
1968 "Proces slovenske kolonizacije istočnog Balkana" [The process of the Slavic settlement on the Eastern Balkans], in *Simpozijum* (1968: 11-27).
- Barkóczy, L.
1964 "The population of Pannonia from Marcus Aurelius to Diocletian", *Acta archaeologica Academiae Hungaricae* 16: 257-356.
- Beloch, K. J.
1897 "Zur griechischen Vorgeschichte", [Sybels] *Historische Zeitschrift* 79: 193-223.
1913 *Griechische Geschichte* 1.2² (Strassburg: Trübner).
- Benac, A.
1961 *Studien zur Stein- und Kupferzeit im nordwestlichen Balkan* (= *Berichte der römisch-germanischen Kommission* 42) (Berlin: de Gruyter 1962).
1964a "Prediliri, Protoiliri i Prailiri - Vorillyrier, Protoillyrier und Urillyrier", in *Simpozijum* (1964: 57-94).
1964b *Studije o kamenom i bakarnom dobu u sjeverozapadnom Balkanu* [Studies on the Stone- and Bronze-Age in the North-Western Balkans] (Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša).
- Beševliev, B.
1929 "Zu Curtius VI, 9, 37", *Philologische Wochenschrift* 21: 652-4.
1932 "Kām vāprosa za narodnosti na starite Makedonci" [On the question of the nationality of the old Macedonians], *GSU, istoriko-filologičeski fakultet* 28: 1-76.
1934-35 "Ein übersehenes Zeugnis über das Nichtgriechentum der alten Makedonen", *Révue internationale des études balkaniques* 1: 280.
1961 "Amlaidina und Sippe", *BalkE* 3.2: 67-70.
1963 "Griechische theophore Personennamen und lateinische Spitznamen der Thraker", *BalkE* 6: 61-70.
1970a *Zur Deutung der Kastellnamen in Prokops Werk "De aedificiis"* (Amsterdam: Hakkert).
1970b *Untersuchungen über die Personennamen bei den Thrakern* (Amsterdam: Hakkert).
- Betz, A.
1936 "Thrakien unter römischer Herrschaft", in PAULY - WISSOWA (1894-2.6.A.1 [= Halbband 11]: 452-72).
- Bižić-Drechsler, R.
1961 "Rezultati iskopavanja japodske nekropole u Kompolju 1955-56" [Results of the excavations of the Iapodic necropolis at Kompolje], *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 2: 67-114.
- Blegen, C. W.
1928 "The coming of the Greeks 2: The geographical distribution of prehistoric remains in Greece", *AJA* 32: 146-54. [cf. HALEY (1928)]
- Blumenthal, A. von
1930 *Hesych Studien* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).

- Bötticher, P.
1851 *Arica* (Halle: Lippert). [in German]
- Brandenstein, W.
1935a "Kleinasiatische Ursprachen", in PAULY - WISSOWA (1894- Supplement 6: 165-181).
1935b "Die Erforschung der Ortsnamen in Altkleinasien", *Zeitschrift für Ortsnamenforschung* 11: 61-78.
1936 "Thrakische Sprache", in PAULY - WISSOWA (1894- 2.6.A.1 [= Halbband 11]: 407-14).
1950 "Der Name Labyrinth", *Die Sprache* 2.2: 72-6.
- Brandis, O.
1901 "Dacia", in PAULY - WISSOWA (1894- 4.2 [= Halbband 8]: 1948-76).
- Brozović, D.
1968 "Doseljenje Slavena i njihovi dodiri sa starosjediocima u svjetlu lingvističkih istraživanja" [The migration of the Slavs to the Balkans and their contacts with the autochthonous population in the light of linguistic research], in *Simpozijum* (1968: 129-40).
- Brunšmid, J.
1898 *Die Inschriften und Münzen der griechischen Städte Dalmatiens* (= *Abhandlungen des archäologisch-epigraphischen Seminars der Universität Wien* 13) (Wien: Benndorf - Bormann).
- Buck, C. D.
1928 *Introduction to the study of the Greek dialects* (New York: Ginn).
- Budimir, M.
1925 "Zur Stellung des Makedonischen", *Archiv za arbanasku starinu, jezik i etnologiju* 4.1: 116-8. [At that time, as fixed by bibliographies, only the offprints appeared; the whole volume was published in 1969 by the Albanological institute of Priština.]
1926-27 "Onomastički i gramatički prilozi" [Onomastic and grammatical contributions], *JslF* 6: 166-79.
1929 "Pathisus - Tisa", *Godišnjak Istorijeskog društva u Novom Sadu* 2: 1-15. [Serbo-Croatian; cyrillic alphabet]
1929-30 "Antički stanovnici Vojvodine; 1. Amantini, 2. Breuci" [The ancient population of the Vojvodina], *Godišnjak Istorijeskog društva u Novom Sadu* 2: 165-75; 3: 10-22.
1931 "Zur Protindogermanischen Schicht", in: *Actes du deuxième congrès international de linguistes, Genève 25-29 Août 1931* (Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve 1933), pp. 182-4.
1933 "Iz klasične i savremene aloglotije" [Aus der klassischen und zeitgenössischen Alloglottie], *Spomenik Srpske Akademije nauka* 76: 35-64.
1934-35 "Griechisch und Makedonisch", *Révue internationale des études balkaniques* 1: 281-2.
1936 "Vorgriechischer Ursprung der homerischen Haupthelden", *Révue internationale des études balkaniques* 2: 195-215.
1937a "Pelastika 1", *Révue internationale des études balkaniques* 3.6: 344.
1937b "O etničkom odnosu Dardanaca prema Ilirima" [The ethnic relationship of the Dardaniacs to the Illyrians], *Jugoslavenski istorijski časopis* 3: 1-30.

- 1937c "Illyrisches", in: *Belićev Zbornik* [Belić-Festschrift] (Beograd: Mlada Srbija), pp. 209-18.
- 1948 "Alaksandus", *Istoriski časopis Srpske akademije nauka* 1: 12-23. [Serbian]
- 1950 *Grci i Pelasti* [Greeks and Pelasgians] (= *Posebna izdanja Srpske akademije nauka* 167) (Beograd: Srpska akademija). [Serbian, with French summary]
- 1951a "Problem bukve i protoslavenske domovine" [The problem of the beech tree and of the Proto-Slavic habitat], *RadJA* 282: 2-32.
- 1951b "Antika i Pelasti" [Antiquity and the Pelasts], *ŽAnt* 1: 78-101. [with summary in Latin]
- 1952a "Hellás - Hèllēn", *Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog instituta* (Beograd) 1: 17-27. [in Serbian, with summary in Latin]
- 1952b "Iliri i prailiri" [Illyrians and Proto-Illyrians], *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* 53: 7-12.
- 1953 "Athēnē hē kai Tritogéneia", *ŽAnt* 3: 5-20. [Serbian]
- 1954 "Be/o-denkos, fundo carens, ábyssos", *ŽAnt* 4: 3-15. [Serbian]
- 1955 "Kouretes, Kyrbantes, Korybantes, Orthokorybantioi, Calamaucus, klobuk", *ŽAnt* 5: 217-26. [in Serbian]
- 1956a "Pelasto-Slavica", *RadJA* 309: 81-194. [Serbian, with summary in Latin]
- 1956b "Lat. *ascia*", *ŽAnt* 6: 239-41. [in Serbian]
- 1956-57 "Nestorov kondir i homerski depas amphikupellon" [Nestor's cup and the depas amphikupellon in Homer], *Starinar* 7-8: 23-7.
- 1957 "O prehelenskim Indoevropljanima na Balkanu" [The Pre-Hellenic Indo-Europeans on the Balkans], in: *Ezikovedski izsledvanija v čest na akademik Stefan Mladenov* (Sofia: Bălgarska akademija), pp. 407-13. [with summary in Latin]
- 1958 "De Iliade quadam Phrygia", *ŽAnt* 8: 227-35. [in Serbian]
- 1959a "De Olympi Homerici imagine contraria", *Glas Srpske akademije nauka* 236: 23-34. [in Serbian]
- 1959b "O starijim pomenima srpskoga imena" [The older mentions of the Serbian name], *Glas Srpske akademije nauka* 236: 35-55.
- 1959c "Flumen nomine Bathinus", *Glas Srpske akademije nauka* 236: 57-64. [in Serbian]
- 1959d "Zeus Labraundos, labrus, laburinthos", *ŽAnt* 9: 85-96. [in German]
- 1960a "Die Kerberier in der Odyssee und im attischen Drama", *ŽAnt* 10: 17-39.
- 1960b "De nominis Serbici vestigiis classicis", *ZbFL* 3: 7-34. [in Serbian]
- 1969 *Sa balkanskih istočnika* [From Balkanic sources] (Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga).
- Čabej, E.
- 1958 "Problemi i autohtonisē sē shqiptaravet nē driten e emravet tē vendeve" [The problem of the autochthony of the Albanians in the light of toponyms], *Buletin i universitetit shtetëror të Tiranës, seria shkencat shoqerore* 12.2: 54-66.
- 1964 "Einige Grundprobleme der älteren albanischen Sprachgeschichte", *SAlb* 1: 69-89.

- 1970 "L'illyrien et l'albanais, questions de principe", *SAlb* 7.1: 157-70. Cankova-Petkova, G.
- 1963 "La survivance du nom des Besses au moyen âge", *BalkE* 6: 93-6. Carnoy, A.
- 1955 *Dictionnaire étymologique du proto-indo-européen* (= *Bibliothèque du Muséon* 39) (Louvain: Publications Universitaires - Institut Orientaliste).
- 1956 *Dictionnaire étymologique des noms grecs de plantes* (= *Bibliothèque du Muséon* 46) (Louvain: Publications Universitaires).
- Carratelli, G. P.
- 1945 "Le iscrizioni preelleniche di Haghia Triada in Creta e della Grecia peninsulare", *Monumenti Antichi* 40: 422-610.
- Chadwick, J.
- 1958 *The decipherment of Linear B* (Cambridge: University Press).
- Chantraine, P.
- 1966 "La langue des Macédoniens et leur onomastique", *BSL* 61: 157-66.
- Charpouthier, F.
- 1930 *Les écritures minoennes au palais de Mallia* (= *Études Crétoises* 2) (Paris: Geuthner).
- Čihař, V.
- 1954 "Die charakteristischen Züge des mediterranen Sub-Substrats", *AO* 22: 406-33.
- Cimochowski, W.
- 1958 "Prejardhja e gjuhës shqipe" [The predecessor of the Albanian language], *Buletin i universitetit shtetëror të Tiranës, seria shkencat shoqerore* 12.2: 37-53. [with French summary]
- Conway, R. S.
- 1901-02 "The Pre-Hellenic inscriptions of Praesos", *Annual of the British School at Athens* 8: 125-56.
- Cortsen, S. P.
- 1930 "Die lemnische Inschrift", *Glotta* 18: 101-9.
- Čović, B.
- 1964a "Osnovne karakteristike materijalne kulture Ilira na njihovom centralnom području - Traits caractéristiques de la culture matérielle des Illyriens, région centrale", in *Simpozijum* (1964: 95-134).
- 1964b "Die Inschrift von Bugojno und ihre Chronologie", *Archaeologica Jugoslavica* 5: 25-32.
- Cox, C. W. M. - A. Cameron
- 1932 "A native inscription from the Myso-Phrygian borderland", *Klio* 25: 34-49.
- Cuny, A.
- 1910 "Les mots du fonds préhellénique en grec, latin et sémitique occidental", *REA* 12.2: 154-64.
- Cvijić, J.
- 1902 "Struktura i podela planina Balkanskog poluostrva" [The structure and the classification of the mountain ranges on the Balkan peninsula], *Glas Srpske akademije nauka* 63: 1-71.

- 1918 *La péninsule balkanique; géographie humaine* (Paris: A. Collin). [translation: Cvijić (1922)]
- 1922 *Balkansko poluostrvo i južnoslovenske zemlje; osnove antropogeografije* [The Balkan peninsula and the South Slavic countries; fundamentals of an anthropogeography] 1 (Zagreb: Hrvatski štamparski zavod d.d.). [= translation of Cvijić (1918); new edition: (Beograd: Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika Socijalističke republike Srbije 1966)]
- Daskalakis, A. B.
- 1960 *Ho Hellenismós tês archaías Makedonías* [The Hellenism of ancient Macedonia] (Athênai: [published by the author]).
- 1965 *The Hellenism of the ancient Macedonians* (Thessaloniki: Institute of Balkan studies).
- Dečev, D.
- 1928 [D. Detschew], *Die dakischen Pflanzennamen* (= *GSU, istoriko-filologički fakultet* 24.1) (Sofia: Chudožnik).
- 1957 [D. Detschew], *Die thrakischen Sprachreste* (= *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Schriften der Balkankommission, linguistische Abteilung* 14) (Wien: Rohrer).
- 1960 "Charakteristik der thrakischen Sprache", *BalkE* 2: 147–213. [= 2nd edition of D. Dečev, *Charakteristika na trakijskijat ezik* (Sofia: Bălgarska akademija 1952)]
- Degmedžić, I.
- 1966 "Sjeverna i istočna granica Ilira" [The northern and eastern boundary of Illyria], in *Simpozijum* (1966: 55–61).
- Deimling, C. W.
- 1862 *Die Leleger* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Deroy, L.
- 1956 "La valeur du suffixe préhellénique *-nth-* d'après quelques noms grecs en *-nthos*", *Glotta* 35: 171–95.
- Devoto, G.
- 1954 "Le fasi della linguistica mediterranea 1", *SE* 23: 217–8. [Cf. DEVOTO (1961)]
- 1961 "Le fasi della linguistica mediterranea 2", *SE* 29: 171–89. [Cf. DEVOTO (1954)]
- 1962a "Mediterranei, Paleoeuropei, Indoeuropei nei riflessi toponomastici", *AMCISO* 7.1: 397–403.
- 1962b *Origini indeuropee* (Firenze: Istituto italiano di Preistoria e Protostoria).
- 1966 "L'eredità linguistica dell'Iliria", in *Simpozijum* (1966: 187–93).
- Hansen, B.
- 1957 *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, im Auftrage der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften unter Leitung ihres ordentlichen Mitgliedes Franz Dornseiff ausgearbeitet von Bernhard Hansen (= *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, philosophisch-historische Klasse* 102.4) (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag).
- Duridanov, I.
- 1960 "Der thrakische Einfluß auf die bulgarische Anthroponymie", *BalkE* 2: 69–86.

- 1963 "Illyrische Flußnamen in Serbien", *BalkE* 6: 101–17.
- 1967a "Der Bergname Osogovo", *BalkE* 11.2: 57–60.
- 1967b "Die Stellung des Päonischen", in: *Actes du 10^e congrès international des linguistes, Bucarest, 28 août – 2 septembre 1967* (Red.: A. Graur et alii) 4 (Bucarest: Editions de l'Académie de la République Socialiste de Roumanie), pp. 759–63.
- 1968 "Die alten Bevölkerungsverhältnisse Makedoniens auf Grund der Toponymie", in: *Actes du premier congrès international des études balkaniques et sud-est européennes, Sofia, 26 août – 1 septembre 1966* 6: *Linguistique* (Ed.: V. Georgiev et alii) (Sofia: Éditions de l'Académie bulgare des sciences), pp. 772–86.
- 1969a *Thrakisch-dakische Studien* 1: *Die thrakisch- und dakisch-baltischen Sprachbeziehungen* (= *BalkE* 13.2) (Sofija: Bulgarische Akademie).
- 1969b "Päonisches und Illyrisches im alten Makedonien", *PICOS* 9: 185–91.
- 1971 "Die Vorgeschichte Mygdoniens im Lichte der Sprache", in: *L'éthnogenèse des peuples balkaniques* (= *Académie bulgare des sciences, institut d'études balkaniques* 5) (Sofija: Izdatel'stvo na BAN), pp. 199–205.
- Ebert, M. (ed.)
- 1924–32 *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter). [1–3 (1924); 4–7 (1926); 8–9 (1927); 10–13.1 (1928); 13.2–14 (1929); 15: *Register* (1932)]
- Evans, A.
- 1935 *Scripta Minoa* 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press). [cf. EVANS-MYRES (1952), MYRES (1954)]
- Evans, A. – J. L. Myres
- 1952 *Scripta Minoa* 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press). [cf. EVANS (1935), MYRES (1954)]
- Fick, A.
- 1866 „Über die Sprache der Makedonier", *Orient und Occident* 2: 718–29.
- 1874 "Zum makedonischen Dialecte", *KZ* 22: 193–235.
- 1879 "Die epirotischen Inschriften von Dodona", *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen* 3: 266–84.
- 1905 *Vorgriechische Ortsnamen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht).
- 1909 *Hattiden und Danubier in Griechenland* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht).
- Fluss, M.
- 1931 "Illyrioi", in PAULY – WISSOWA (1894– Supplement 5: 311–45).
- Forrer, E.
- 1922 "Die Inschriften und Sprachen des Hatti-Reiches", *ZDMG* 76: 174–269.
- 1924a "Die Griechen in den Boghazköi-Texten", *OLZ* 26: 223–8.
- 1924b "Vorhomerische Griechen in den Keilinschriften von Boghazköi", *Mitteilungen der Deutschen orientalischen Gesellschaft* 63: 1–22. [cf. FRIEDRICH (1927) and FORRER (1929)]
- 1928 "Aḥḥijavā", in: *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* (Ed.: E. Ebeling – B. Meißner) 11 (Berlin: de Gruyter), pp. 53–7.

- 1929 "Für die Griechen in den Boghazköi-Inschriften", *Kleinasiatische Forschungen* 1.2: 252–72.
- 1938 "Quelle und Brunnen in Alt-Vorderasien", *Glotta* 26: 178–202.
- Friedrich, J.
1927 "Werden in den hethitischen Keilschrifttexten die Griechen erwähnt?", *Kleinasiatische Forschungen* 1.1: 87–107. [cf. FORRER (1924b, 1929)]
- 1941 "Phrygia (Sprache, Geschichte)", in PAULY – WISSOWA (1894–20 [= Halbband 39]: 868–91).
- 1952–54 *Hethitisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg: Winter).
- Furumark, A.
1956 *Linear A und die altkretische Sprache; Entzifferung und Deutung*, lecture held at the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut at Berlin, July 10th, 1956. [mimeographed]
- Gabrovec, S.
1964 "Problem severnozahodnega področja Ilirov – Das Problem des nordwestillyrischen Gebietes", in *Simpozijum* (1964: 215–52).
- Gălăbov, I.
1963 "Die thrakischen -enos-Bildungen", *BalkE* 6: 75–9.
- Gamkrelidze, T. V.
1957 "Xettskie jazyki" i vopros o pereselenii v Maluju Aziju indoevropskix plemen ["Hittite languages" and the question of the migration to Asia Minor of Indo-European tribes] (= *Trudy Instituta jazykoznanija Akademii Nauk Gruzinskoj SSR* 2) (Tbilisi: Gruzian Academy of Sciences).
- Garašanin, M.
1957 "Ka jezičnoj pripadnosti neolitskog prastanovništva Balkana" [On the linguistic affiliations of the neolithic autochthonous population of the Balkans], *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja u Sarajevu* 12: 201–16.
- 1959 *Neolithikum und Bronzezeit in Serbien und Makedonien* (= *Berichte der römisch-germanischen Kommission* 39) (Frankfurt a.M.: de Gruyter).
- 1964 "Istočna granica Ilira prema arheološkim spomenicima – Die Ostgrenze der Illyrier auf Grund der Bodenfunde", in *Simpozijum* (1964: 135–75).
- Gavela, B.
1951 "Skordisci u našoj zemlji prema antičkim piscima" [The Scordisci in our country according to the ancient authors], *ŽAnt* 1: 275–8.
- Georgiev, V.
1936 *Die Träger der kretisch-mykenischen Kultur, ihre Herkunft und ihre Sprache* (= *GUS* 33) (Sofija: Pridvorna Pečatnica). [title Bulgarian and German, text in German]
- 1941–45 *Vorgriechische Sprachwissenschaft*, 2 vol. (= *GUS* 37, 41) (Sofija: University Press).
- 1949 "État actuel des recherches et coordination du travail dans le domaine des langues anciennes balkanoasiatiques", *AO* 17: 275–87.
- 1955 *Lexique des inscriptions créto-mycéniennes* (Sofija: Izdan. na Bălgarskata Akademia na Naukite).
- 1957b "Le déchiffrement des inscriptions crétoises en linéaire A", in: *Eziko-*

- vedski izsledvanija v čest na akademik Stefan Mladenov* (Sofija: Izdan. na Bălgarskata Akademia na Naukite), pp. 419–26.
- 1957b *Trakijski jazyk* [The Thracian language] (Sofija: Izdan. na Bălgarskata Akademia na Naukite). [with French summary]
- 1958a "Das Pelasgische", in: *Proceedings of the eighth international congress of linguists* (Ed.: Eva Sivertsen) (Oslo: Oslo University Press), pp. 406–13.
- 1958b *Issledovanija po sravnitel'no-istoričeskomu jazykoznaniju* [Studies in comparative-historical linguistics] (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo inostrannoj literatury).
- 1958c *Die altgriechischen Flußnamen* (Sofija: Bulgarische Akademie der Wissenschaften).
- 1958d *Văprosi na bălgarskata etimologija* [Questions of Bulgarian etymology] (Sofija: Bălgarska Akademia na Naukite).
- 1959a "Contribution à l'étude de l'étymologie grecque", *BalkE* 1: 69–86.
- 1959b "Die Herkunft der Namen der größten Flüsse der Balkanhalbinsel und ihre Bedeutung zur Ethnogenese der Balkanvölker", *BalkE* 1: 5–27.
- 1960a *Bălgarska etimologija i onomastika* [Bulgarian etymology and onomastics] (Sofija: Izdan. na Bălgarskata Akademia na Naukite). [with French summary pp. 131–57]
- 1960b "Albanisch, Dakisch-Mysisch und Rumänisch", *BalkE* 2: 1–19.
- 1961 *La toponymie ancienne de la péninsule balkanique et la thèse méditerranéenne* (= *BalkE* 3.1) (Sofia: Académie Bulgare des Sciences).
- 1963a *Les deux langues des inscriptions crétoises en linéaire A* (= *BalkE* 7.1) (Sofija: Académie Bulgare des Sciences).
- 1963b "Thrace et illyrien", *BalkE* 6: 71–4.
- 1964a "L'importance des toponymes mycéniens pour les problèmes de l'histoire de la langue grecque et l'ethnogenèse des Grecs 1", *BalkE* 9.1: 5–39.
- 1964b "Die dakischen Glossen und ihre Bedeutung zum Studium der dakischen Sprache", *BalkE* 8: 5–14.
- 1965 "Zum Dakischen", *ZBalk* 3: 101–5.
- 1966a *Introduzione alla storia delle lingue indeuropee* (Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo).
- 1966b *Die Deutung der altentwischen thrakischen Inschrift aus Kjolmen* (= *BalkE* 11.1) (Sofija: Bulgarische Akademie der Wissenschaften).
- 1966c "Was stellt die Pelasgertheorie dar?", *Lingua* 16: 263–73. [cf. HESTER (1966)]
- Geyer, P.
1928 "Makedonia (Erdgeschichte, Topographie, Orographie, Hydrographie, Verkehrsstraßen, Erzeugnisse und Bodenschätze, Geschichte, Verfassung)", in PAULY – WISSOWA (1894–14.1 [= Halbband 27]: 638–81, 697–771).
- Gindin, L. A.
1959 "Obzor literatury po 'pelazgijskomu' jazyku" [Review of the writings on the "Pelasgian" language], *VJa* 8.5: 105–14.
- 1967 *Jazyk drevnejšego naselenija juga Balkanskogo poluostrova* [The

- language of the most ancient population of the South of the Balkan peninsula] (Moskva: Nauka).
- Goetze, A.
 1953 "The theophorous elements of the Anatolian proper names from Cappadocia", *Lg* 29: 263-77.
 1954a "Some groups of ancient Anatolian proper names", *Lg* 30: 348-59.
 1954b "The linguistic continuity of Anatolia as shown by its proper names", *JCS* 8.6: 62-79.
 1957 "Cilicians", *JCS* 16: 48-58.
 1962 *Kleinasien* (München: Beck).
- Gordon, C. H.
 1957a "Notes on Minoan Linear A", *Antiquity* 31: 124-30.
 1957b "Akkadian tablets in Minoan dress", *Antiquity* 31: 237-40.
 1962a "Minoica", *JNES* 21: 207-10.
 1962b "Eteocretan", *JNES* 21: 211-4.
 1963 "The Dréros bilingual", *JSS* 8: 76-9.
- Grafenauer, B.
 1968 "Proces doseljavanja Slovena na zapadni Balkan i u istočne Alpe" [The process of the Slavic settlement on the western Balkans and in the eastern Alps], in *Simpozijum* (1968: 29-55).
- Haas, O.
 1939 "Über die phrygischen Sprachreste und ihr Verhältnis zum Armenischen", *Handes Amsorya* 7-12: 225-35.
 1951 "Substrats et mélange de langue en Grèce ancienne", *LPosn* 3: 63-95.
 1957 "Die sprachgeschichtliche Stellung des Phrygischen", in: *Ezikovedski izsledvanija v čest na akademik Stefan Mladenov* (Sofija: Izdan. na Bălgarskata Akademia na Naukite), pp. 451-67.
 1959a "Die Lehre von den indogermanischen Substraten in Griechenland", *BalkE* 1: 29-56.
 1959b "Elaiwon: Das Öl und die ersten Indoeuropäer Griechenlands", *LPosn* 7: 54-76.
 1960a *Das frühitalische Element; Versuch über die Sprache der ersten Indogermanen Italiens* (Wien: Notring der Wissenschaftlichen Verbände Österreichs).
 1960b "Die phrygische Sprache im Lichte der Glossen und Namen", *BalkE* 2: 25-68.
 1961a "Lexikalische Anklänge an Slavisches in den Sprachresten Kleinasien und Griechenlands", *GABiH* 2: 65-99.
 1961b "Armenier und Phryger", *BalkE* 3.2: 29-65.
 1970 "Das Problem der Herkunft der Phryger und ihrer Beziehung zu den Balkanvölkern", *Acta antiqua Academiae scientiarum Hungaricae* 18: 31-69.
- Hahn, J. G. von
 1854 *Albanesische Studien* (Jena: Mauke). [also: (Wien: Hof- und Staatsdruckerei 1853)]
- Haley, J. B.
 1928 "The coming of the Greeks 1. The geographical distribution of Pre-Greek place-names", *AJA* 32: 141-5. [cf. BLEGEN (1928)]

- Hammond, N. G. L.
 1967 *Epirus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Hampel, F.
 1960 "Die Chronologie der Einwanderung der griechischen Stämme und das Problem der Nationalität der Träger der mykenischen Kultur", *MH* 17: 57-86.
- Harmatta, J.
 1964 "Das Pelasgische und die alten Balkansprachen", *BalkE* 9.1: 41-7.
 1967 "Zum Illyrischen", *Acta antiqua Academiae scientiarum Hungaricae* 15: 231-4.
- Hatzidakis, G. N.
 1897 *Zur Abstammung der alten Makedonier, eine ethnologische Studie* (Athen: Barth - von Hirst).
 1900 "Zur Ethnologie der alten Makedonier", *IF* 11: 313-20.
 1928 "L'hellénisme de la Macédonie", *REG* 41: 390-415.
- Helbig, W.
 1876 "Studien über die älteste italische Geschichte 1. Über die Herkunft der Iapygier", *Hermes* 11: 257-90.
- Herbig, G.
 1927 "Messapier", in EBERT (1927 8: 167-70).
- Hermann, K. F.
 1889-92 *Lehrbuch der griechischen Staatsaltertümer, aus dem Standpunkt der Geschichte entworfen*, 2 vol., umgearbeitet und herausgegeben von V. Thumser (Freiburg im Breisgau: Mohr) [1st edition, without subtitle (Heidelberg: Mohr 1831)]
- Hester, D. A.
 1957 "Pre-Greek place names in Greece and Asia Minor", *Revue hittite et arienne* 15.61: 1-37.
 1965 "'Pelasgian' - a new Indo-European language?", *Lingua* 13: 335-84.
 1966 "A reply to Professor Georgiev's 'Was stellt die Pelasgertheorie dar' ", *Lingua* 16: 274-8 [cf. GEORGIEV (1966)]
 1967 "Methods of identifying loan-word strata in Greek", *Lingua* 18: 168-78.
 1968 "Recent developments in Mediterranean 'substrate'-studies", *Minos* 9: 219-35.
- Heubeck, A.
 1961 *Praegraeca; sprachliche Untersuchungen zum vorgriechisch-indogermanischen Substrat* (= *Erlanger Forschungen* 12) (Erlangen: Universitätsbund). [rec.: KATIČIĆ (1964d)]
- Hirt, H.
 1898 "Die sprachliche Stellung des Illyrischen", in: *Beiträge zur alten Geschichte und Geographie* (= *Festschrift für Heinrich Kiepert*) (Berlin: Reimer), pp. 179-88.
 1905-07 *Die Indogermanen; ihre Verbreitung, ihre Heimat, ihre Kultur*, 2 vol. (Strassburg: Trübner).
- Hoffmann, O.
 1906 *Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht). [rec.: SOLMSEN (1907)]

- 1928 "Makedonia (Volkstum und Sprache)", in PAULY - WISSOWA (1894-14.1 [= Halbband 27]: 681-97).
- Huber, J.
1921 *De lingua antiquissimorum Graeciae incolarum* (= *Commentationes Aenipontanae* 9) (Wien - Innsbruck: Wagner).
- Hubschmid, J.
1960a *Mediterrane Substrate, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Baskischen und der west-östlichen Sprachbeziehungen* (Bern: Francke).
1960b "Substratprobleme; eine neue ibero-romanisch-alpin-lombardische Wortgleichung vorindogermanischen Ursprungs und die vorindogermanischen Suffixe -ano- und -s(s)-", *VR* 19: 124-73, 245-99.
1961 *Zur Geschichte, Problematik und Methodik der Erklärung von Ortsnamen aus dem mediterranen Substrat* (= *Studia onomastica monacensia* 3) (München: Hubschmid).
1965 "Metody issledovanija doromanskogo i sredizemnomorskogo substrata" [Methods of investigation of the Pre-Romance and Mediterranean substratum], in: *Ėtimologija 1965* (Red.: O. N. Trubačev *et alii*) (Moskva: Nauka 1967), pp. 235-47.
- Hutchinson, R. W.
1962 *Prehistoric Crete* (London: Penguin).
- Huxley, G.
1961 *Crete and the Luwians* (Oxford: [the author]).
- Illirëi
1969 *Ilirët dhe gjeneza e shqiptareve* [The Illyrians and the genesis of the Albanians], session shkencor 3-4 mars (Tiranë: Universiteti shtetëror).
- Jacoby, F.
1912 "Hekataios", in PAULY - WISSOWA (1894- 7.2 [= Halbband 14]: 2667-769).
- Jokl, N.
1924 "Albaner", in EBERT (1924-32 1: 84-94).
1926 "Illyrier", in EBERT (1924-32 6: 33-50).
1927-28 "Phryger", in EBERT (1924-32 10: 141-53).
1929 "Thraker", in EBERT (1924-32 13: 277-98).
1963 "Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse des Albanischen zu den übrigen indogermanischen Sprachen", *Die Sprache* 9: 113-56. [written in 1920-25]
- Josifović, St.
1957 "Lykophonstudien", *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 2: 199-230.
- Kaerst, J.
1905 "Epeiros (Geschichte)", in PAULY - WISSOWA (1894- 5.2 [= Halbband 10]: 2723-31).
- Kalléris, J. N.
1954 *Les anciens Macédoniens, étude linguistique et historique 1: Introduction; la langue* (= *Collection de l'Institut français d'Athènes* 81) (Athènes: Klincksieck).

- Katičić, R.
1961a "Veselia Felicetas", *BNF* 12: 271-9. [in German]
1961b "Problemi proučavanja ilirskog jezika" [Problems presented by the study of the Illyrian language], *Književnik* 19: 38-54.
1962a "Lynkos und die Lynkestes", *BNF* 13: 126-43.
1962b "Die illyrischen Personennamen in ihrem südöstlichen Verbreitungsgebiet", *ŽAnt* 12: 95-120.
1963 "Das mitteldalmatische Namensgebiet", *ŽAnt* 12: 255-292.
1964a "Namengebiete im römischen Dalmatien", *Die Sprache* 10: 23-33.
1964b "Illyrii proprie dicti", *ŽAnt* 13-14: 87-97. [in German; cf. KATIČIĆ (1966b)]
1964c "Suvremena istraživanja o jeziku starosjedilaca ilirskih provincija - Die neuesten Forschungen über die einheimische Sprachschicht in den illyrischen Provinzen", in *Simpozijum* (1964: 9-58).
1964d Review of HEUBECK (1961), *Kratylos* 9: 27-31.
1965a "Zur Frage der keltischen und pannonischen Namensgebiete im römischen Dalmatien", *GABiH* 3: 53-76.
1965b "Pedion melóboton", *ŽAnt* 15: 61-2. [in German]
1966a "Keltska osobna imena u antičkoj Sloveniji" [Celtic anthroponymy in ancient Slovenia], *Arheološki vestnik* 17: 145-68.
1966b "Nochmals Illyrii proprie dicti", *ŽAnt* 16: 241-4. [cf. KATIČIĆ (1964b)]
1968a "Die einheimische Namensgebung von Ig", *GABiH* 6: 61-120.
1968b "Liburner, Pannonier und Illyrier", in: *Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft und Kulturkunde; Gedenkschrift für Wilhelm Brandenstein (1898-1967)* (Ed.: M. Mayrhofer *et alii*) (= *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft* 14) (Innsbruck: Gesellschaft zur Pflege der Geisteswissenschaften), pp. 363-8.
1968c "Narodi i jezici antičke Slavonije" [Peoples and languages in ancient Slavonia], in: *Simpozij Doprinos Slavonije hrvatskoj književnosti* (Ed. I. Frangeš *et alii*) (Vinkovci - Zagreb: Skupština općine Vinkovci).
1970 *A contribution to the general theory of comparative linguistics* (= *Janua linguarum, series minor* 83) (The Hague: Mouton).
- Kazarov, G.
1910a *Etnografskoto položenie na starite Makedonci* [The ethnographic status of the ancient Macedonians] (Sofija).
1910b "Quelques observations sur la question de la nationalité des anciens Macédoniens", *REG* 23: 243-54.
1921 *Peonija, prinos kām starata etnografija i istorija na Makedonija* [Paeonia; a contribution to the ancient ethnography and history of Macedonia] (Sofija).
1922-23 "Die ethnographische Stellung der Päonen", *Klio* 18: 20-6.
1936 "Thrake (Religion)", in PAULY - WISSOWA (1894- 2.11: 472-551).
- Kerényi, A.
1970 *Die Personennamen von Dazien* (Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum).
- Kiepert, H.
1878 *Lehrbuch der alten Geographie* (Berlin: Reimer).

Konda, S. N.

- 1964 *Shqiptarët dhe problemi pellazgjik* [The Albanians and the Pelasgian problem] (Tiranë: [the author]).

Kostallari, A. et alii (ed.)

- 1968 *Konferenca e dyte e studimeve albanologjike, Tiranë 12-18 janar* [The second conference of Albanian Studies], 3 vol. (Tiranë: Universiteti shtetëror).

Krahe, H.

- 1925 *Die alten balkanillyrischen geographischen Namen* (= *Indogermanische Bibliothek* 7) (Heidelberg: Winter).
- 1928 "Eine balkanillyrische Inschrift", *IF* 46: 183-185.
- 1929 *Lexikon altillyrischer Personennamen* (= *Indogermanische Bibliothek* 9) (Heidelberg: Winter).
- 1929-37 "Die Ortsnamen des antiken Apulien und Calabrien", *Zeitschrift für Ortsnamenforschung* 5 (1929): 3-25, 139-66; 7 (1931): 9-33; 13 (1937): 20-31.
- 1935 "Beiträge zur Makedonenfrage", *Zeitschrift für Ortsnamenforschung* 11: 78-103.
- 1937a "Die Illyrier in ihren sprachlichen Beziehungen zu Italikern und Griechen", *Die Welt als Geschichte* 3: 119-36; 284-99.
- 1937b "Die sprachliche Stellung des Illyrischen", *Pannonia* 3: 291-312.
- 1939 "Illyriön Enetof", *RhM* 88: 97-101. [in German]
- 1939-43 "Die Ortsnamen des antiken Lukanien und Bruttierlandes", *Zeitschrift für Namenforschung* 15 (1939): 75-85, 110-40; 17 (1941): 127-50; 19 (1943): 58-72, 127-41.
- 1940 "Der Anteil der Illyrier an der Indogermanisierung Europas", *Die Welt als Geschichte* 6: 54-73.
- 1954 *Sprache und Vorzeit* (Heidelberg: Quelle und Meyer).
- 1955-64 *Die Sprache der Illyrier*, 2 vol. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz). [1: 1955; 2: 1964]
- 1957 *Vorgeschichtliche Sprachbeziehungen von den baltischen Ostseeländern bis zu den Gebieten um den Nordeil der Adria* (= *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz, Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse* 3) (Wiesbaden: Steiner).
- 1959 *Sprachliche Aufgliederung und Sprachbewegungen in Alteuropa* (= *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz, Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse* 1959.1) (Wiesbaden: Steiner).
- 1963 *Die Struktur der alteuropäischen Hydronymie* (= *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz, Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse* 1962.5) (Mainz: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur; Wiesbaden: Steiner).
- 1964 "Vom Illyrischen zum Alteuropäischen. Methodologische Betrachtungen zur Wandlung des Begriffes 'Illyrisch'", *IF* 69: 201-12.

Kretschmer, P.

- 1896 *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht).

- 1915 "Die erste thrakische Inschrift", *Glotta* 6: 74-9.
- 1924 "Alakšanduš, König von Viluša", *Glotta* 13: 205-13.
- 1925a "Die protindogermanische Schicht", *Glotta* 14: 300-19.
- 1925b "Das nt- Suffix", *Glotta* 14: 84-106.
- * 1927a *Sprache; Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*³ (Ed.: A. Gercke - E. Norden) 1.6 (Leipzig - Berlin: Teubner). [1st edition: (1910)]
- 1927b "Makedon. *dliza*", *Glotta* 15: 305-6.
- 1930 "Zur Frage der griechischen Namen in den hethitischen Texten", *Glotta* 18: 161-70.
- 1933a "Nordische Lehnwörter im Altgriechischen", *Glotta* 22: 100-22.
- 1933b "Zur ältesten Sprachgeschichte Kleinasien", *Glotta* 21: 76-100.
- 1933c "Die Hypachäer", *Glotta* 21: 213-57.
- 1936 "Nochmals die Hypachäer und Alakšanduš", *Glotta* 24: 203-34.
- 1939-40 "Die Stellung der lykischen Sprache", *Glotta* 27: 256-61; 28: 101-16.
- 1940-43 "Die vorgriechischen Sprach- und Volksschichten", *Glotta* 28: 231-78; 30: 84-218.
- 1942 "Die tyrrenischen Inschriften der Stele von Lemnos", *Glotta* 29: 89-98.
- 1948 "Die ältesten Sprachschichten auf Kreta", *Glotta* 31: 1-20.
- 1951 "Kontamination lautähnlicher Worte", *Die Sprache* 2.3: 150-5.
- 1953 "Die Leleger und die ostmediterrane Urbevölkerung", *Glotta* 32: 161-204.
- 1954 "Achäer in Kleinasien zur Hethiterzeit", *Glotta* 33: 1-25.

Kronasser, H.

- 1960 "Parnassós-Larnassós", in: *Indogermanica; Festschrift für Wolfgang Krause zum 65. Geburtstage am 18. September 1960* von Fachgenossen und Freunden dargebracht (Heidelberg: Winter), pp. 51-62.
- 1962 "Zum Stand der Illyristik", *BalE* 4: 5-23.
- 1962-63 *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache*, Lieferung 1-3 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz). [cf.: fascicles 1-6 published as H. Kronasser, *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache* 1: *Zur Schreibung und Lautung des Hethitischen* [pp. 3-105]; 2: *Wortbildung des Hethitischen* [pp. 106-590] (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz 1966)]
- 1965 "Illyrier und Illyricum", *Die Sprache* 11: 155-83.

Kurz, K.

- 1967 "Zur Ethnizität der Japoden", *LF* 90.3: 256-69.

Lagarde, P. de

- 1866 *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* (Leipzig: Brockhaus).

Lahovary, J.

- 1957 *La diffusion des langues anciennes du Proche-Orient; leurs relations avec le basque, le dravidien et les parlers indo-européens primitifs* (Bern: Francke).

Laroche, E.

- 1947 *Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites* (= *Revue hittite et asianique* 7.17.46) (Paris: Klincksieck).
- 1950 *Problèmes de la linguistique asianique* (= *Conférence de l'institut de linguistique de l'Université de Paris* 9) (Paris: Klincksieck).

- 1957 "Notes de toponymie anatolienne", in: *Mnémēs chārin; Gedenkschrift Paul Kretschmer, 2. Mai 1866 – 9. März 1958* 2 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz; Wien: Brüder Hollinek).
- 1959 *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite* (= *Bibliothèque archéologique et historique de l'Institut français d'archéologie d'Istanbul* 6) (Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve).
- 1961 "Études de toponymie anatolienne", *RHA* 19: 57–98.
- Lassen, Ch.
1856 "Über die lykischen Inschriften und die alten Sprachen Kleinasien", *ZDMG* 10: 329–88.
- Lejeune, M.
1947 "Linguistique préhellénique", *REA* 49: 25–37.
- Lenk, B.
1936 "Thrake (Stämme, Geschichte)", in PAULY – WISSOWA (1894– 2.4.5 [= Halbband 11]: 404–7, 414–52).
- 1942 "Paiones", in PAULY – WISSOWA (1894– 18.1 [= Halbband 36.1]: 2403–8.
- Lepore, Ettore
1962 *Ricerche sull'antico Epiro; le origini storiche e gli interessi Greci* (= *Collana di studi greci diretta da Vittorio de Falco* 38) (Napoli: Libreria scientifica editrice).
- Lesny, V.
1909 "Ein Beitrag zur Sprache des alten Makedoniens", *KZ* 42: 297–302.
- Lochner-Hüttenbach, F. von
1960 *Die Pelasger* (= *Arbeiten aus dem Institut für vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft* 6) (Wien: Gerold).
- Lučić, J.
1966 "O migracijama ilirskog plemena Ardičejaca" [On the migrations of the Illyrian tribe of the Ardiaei], *ŽAnt* 16: 245–54.
- Mann, S. E.
1952 "The Indo-European consonants in Albanian", *Lg* 28: 31–40.
- Maresch, G.
1925 "Der Name der Tyndariden", *Glotta* 14: 298–9.
- Marić, Z.
1964 "Problem sjevernog graničnog područja Ilira – Problème des limites septentrionales du territoire illyrien", in *Simpozijum* (1964: 176–213).
- Matveev, A. K.
1965 "Nekotorye voprosy lingvističeskogo analiza substratnoj toponimiki" [Some questions of the linguistic analysis of substratum toponymy], *VJa* 6: 3–15.
- Mayer, A.
1940 "De Iapodibus, populo Illyrico Celtis commixto", in: *Serta Hoffilleriana, commentationes gratulatoriae Victori Hoffiller sexagenario obtulerunt collegae, amici, discipuli a.d. XI Kal. Mar. 1937* (= *Vjesnika Hrvatskoga arheološkoga društva, nove serije sveske* 18–21) (Zagreb: Štampala "Zaklada tiskare narodnih novina sa Zagrebu"), pp. 189–99. [in Croatian]

- 1952 "Über das Verhältnis des Makedonischen zum Illyrischen", *Glotta* 32: 45–89.
- 1957–59 *Die Sprache der alten Illyrier*, 2 vol. (= *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Schriften der Balkankommission* 15, 16) (Wien: R.M. Rohrer).
- Meillet, A.
1908–09 "De quelques emprunts probables en grec et en latin", *Mémoires de la société linguistique de Paris* 15: 161–5.
- Mellaart, J.
1958 "The end of the early Bronze Age in Anatolia and the Aegean", *AJA* 62: 9–33.
- 1960 "Anatolia and the Balkans", *Antiquity* 34: 270–8.
- Meriggi, P.
1936a "Der Indogermanismus des Lykischen", in: *Germanen und Indogermanen; Volkstum, Sprache, Heimat, Kultur* (= *Festschrift für Herman Hirt*) (Ed.: Helmuth Arntz) 2: *Ergebnisse der Sprachwissenschaft* (= *Indogermanische Bibliothek* 3.15.1) (Heidelberg: Winter), pp. 257–82.
- 1956 *Relations entre le minoen B, le minoen A et le cypro-minoen* (*Études mycéniennes*) (Paris: Centre national des recherches scientifiques).
- Merker, I. L.
1965 "The ancient kingdom of Paionia", *Balkan studies* 6: 35–54.
- Merlingen, W.
1953–54 *Kretische Sprachreste im Griechischen* (Wien: [privately circulated]).
- 1955 *Das "Vorgriechische" und die sprachwissenschaftlich-vorhistorischen Grundlagen* (Wien: Gerold).
- 1962 "Zum 'Vorgriechischen'", *BalkE* 4: 25–55; 5.2: 5–44.
- 1963 *Eine ältere Lehnwortschicht im Griechischen* 1: *Lautgeschichte* (= *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften* 17) (Wien: Böhlau).
- 1967 "Fair play for Pelasgian", *Lingua* 18: 144–67.
- Meyer, E.
1892 *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte* 1 (Halle: Max Niemeyer).
- 1893 *Geschichte des Altertums* 2 (Stuttgart: Cotta'sche Buchhandlung).
- Meyer, G.
1875 "Zur makedonischen Sprachfrage", *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 3: 185–92.
- Mócsy, A.
1959 *Die Bevölkerung von Pannonien bis zu den Markomannenkriegen* (Budapest: Akadémiai kiadó).
- 1966 "Die lingua Pannonica", in *Simpozijum* (1966: 195–200).
- Müller, K. O.
1825 *Über die Wohnsitze, die Abstammung und die ältere Geschichte des makedonischen Volks; eine ethnographische Untersuchung* (Berlin: Mylius).
- Myres, J.
1907 "A history of the Pelasgian theory", *IHS* 27: 170–225.
- 1954 *Scripta Minoa* 3 (Oxford: Clarendon Press). [cf.: EVANS (1935). EVANS – MYRES (1952)]

- Neumann, G.
 1957 "Zur Sprache der kretischen Linearschrift A", *Glotta* 36: 156–8.
 1960–61 "Weitere mykenische und minoische Gefäßnamen", *Glotta* 39: 172–8.
 Nicosia Margani, M.
 1954 *La stele pelasga di Lemno* (Comiso: Baglieri).
 Nilsson, M. P.
 1909 *Studien zur Geschichte des alten Epeiros* (Lund: Ohlson).
 Oberhummer, E.
 1899 "Bryges", in PAULY – WISSOWA (1894– 3.1 [= Halbband 5]: 920–1).
 1936 "Thrake (Name, Grenzen, das Land, Klima, Produkte, Bevölkerung)", in PAULY – WISSOWA (1894– 2.4.5 [= Halbband 11]: 392–404).
 Ogenova, L.
 1958 "Ilirskij nadpis ot severna Albanija" [The Illyrian inscription from North Albania], in: *Izsledvanija v čest na akademik D. Dečev* (Eds.: V. Beševliev – Vl. Georgiev) (Sofija: Academy Press), pp. 333–41.
 1959 "Nouvelle interprétation de l'inscription 'illyrienne' d'Albanie", *BCH* 83.2: 794–9.
 Oštir, K.
 1911–13 "Etymologische und grammatische Versuche", *Wörter und Sachen* 3 (1911): 205–8; 4 (1912): 211–8; 5 (1913): 217–22.
 1921 *Beiträge zur alarodischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Wien: E. Beyer).
 1923 "Illyro-Thrakisches", *Arhiv za arbanasku starinu, jezik i etnologiju* 1: 78–137.
 1925 "Illyro-Pelasgica", *Arhiv za arbanasku starinu, jezik i etnologiju* 2: 21–69. [in German]
 1925–26 "Vorindogermanische (= alarodische)Zahlwörter auf dem Balkan", *Arhiv za arbanasku starinu, jezik i etnologiju* 2: 263–324; 3: 126–62.
 1926 "Danuvius – Assamus – Naissus", *Arhiv za arbanasku starinu, jezik i etnologiju* 3: 348–79. [in German]
 1926–27 "K predslovanski etnologiji Zakarpatja" [On the Pre-Slavic ethnology of the country behind the Carpathians], *Etnolog* 1: 1–35.
 1927a "Slav. slon 'Elephant'", *Slavia* 6: 1–17.
 1927b "Vorthrakischer Ursprung des Wortes Byzantium" [Vortrag gehalten auf dem 2. Byzantinologenkongress in Belgrad (11.–16. April 1927), Sektion 1: Byzantinische Philologie; Inhaltsangabe nach dem serbokroatischen Auszug in:] *Glasnik Skopskog naučnog društva* 3 (1928): 328.
 1928 "Veneti in Anti", *Etnolog* 2: 46–73.
 1929 "Japodi", *Etnolog* 3: 87–113.
 1930 "Drei vor-slavisches-etruskische Vogelnamen", *Razprave Znanstvenega društva za humanistične vede* 8: 1–112.
 Pajakowski, W.
 1970 *Starożytny Epir i jego mieszkańcy* [Ancient Epirus and its inhabitants] (= *Uniwersytet w Poznaniu, Prace wydziału filozoficzno-historycznego, seria historica* 35) (Poznań: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe).
 Pallottino, M.
 1955 *The Etruscans* (London: Penguin).
 1963 *Etruscologia* (Milano: Hoepli). [1st edition: (1942)]

- Palmer, L. R.
 1958a "Luvian and Linear A", *Athenaeum* 36: 431–433.
 1958b "Luvian and Linear A", *TPhS*: 36–74.
 1962 *Mycenaeans and Minoans* (New York: Knopf).
 Papazoglu, F.
 1957 *Makedonski gradovi u rimsko doba* [Macedonian cities in Roman times] (= *ŽAnt, posebna izdanja* 1) (Skopje: Filozofski fakultet).
 1963 "O teritoriji ilirskog plemena Ardieja" [On the territory of the Illyrian tribe of the Ardiae], *Zbornik Filozofskog fakulteta u Beogradu* 7.1: 71–86.
 1964 „Dardanska onomastika” [Dardanian onomastics], *Zbornik Filozofskog fakulteta u Beogradu* 8.1: 49–75.
 1965 "Les origines et la destinée de l'état illyrien: Illyrii proprie dicti", *Historia* 14: 143–79.
 1966 "Politička organizacije Ilira u vreme njihove samostalnosti" [The political organization of the Illyrians in the time of their independence], in *Simpozijum* (1966: 11–31).
 1967 "Poreklo i razvoj ilirske države" [Origin and development of the Illyrian state], *GABiH* 5: 123–44.
 1969 *Srednjobalkanska plemena u predrimsko doba* [The central Balkanic tribes in Pre-Roman times] (= *Djela Akademije nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine* 30) (Sarajevo: Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine). [with French summary]
 Pape, W. – G. Benseler
 1959 *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, 2 vol. (= *Handbuch der griechischen Sprache* 3) (Graz: Akademische Druck und Verlagsanstalt). [= reprint]
 Parlangeli, O.
 1960a *Studi Messapici* (= *Memorie dell'Istituto lombardo, Accademia di scienze e lettere, classe di lettere, scienze morali e storiche* 26) (Milano: Istituto Lombardo).
 1960b "La penisola Balcanica e l'Italia", in: *Indoeuropeo e protostoria; atti del 3 convegno internazionale di linguisti tenuto a Milano nei giorni 6–10 settembre 1958 presso il Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese* (Milano: Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese, Istituto di Glottologia, Università di Milano 1961), pp. 109–35.
 Pašalić, E.
 1966 "Problemi ekonomskog razvitka u unutrašnjosti rimske provincije Dalmacije" [Problems of economic development in the interior of the Roman province of Dalmatia], in *Simpozijum* (1966: 111–37).
 Patsch, C.
 1907 "Thrakische Spuren an der Adria", *Österreichische Jahreshefte* 10: 169–74.
 Pauli, C.
 1886 *Altitalische Forschungen 2: Eine vorgriechische Inschrift von Lemnos* (Leipzig: Barth).
 1891 *Altitalische Forschungen 3: Die Veneter und ihre Schriftdenkmäler* (Leipzig: Barth).

- Pauly, O. – G. Wissowa
1894 *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaften*, neue Bearbeitung (Ed.: Georg Wissowa et alii) (Stuttgart: Metzler).
- Pavlović, M.
1965 "Prilog lingvističkoj geografiji Ilirikuma" [A contribution to the linguistic geography of Illyrium], *ZbFL* 8: 58–66.
1968 "Les termes pastoraux en Illyricum", *ZbFL* 8: 58–66.
1969 "Onomastica Illyrica", *Onomastica Iugoslavica* 1: 24–46.
- Pedersen, H.
1900 "Die Gutturale im Albanischen", *KZ* 36: 277–340.
- Pellegrini, G. B. – A. L. Prodocimi
1967 *La lingua venetica*, 2 vol. (Padova: Istituto di glottologia dell'Università di Padova, Circolo linguistico fiorentino).
- Peruzzi, E.
1959 "Recent interpretations of Minoan (Linear A)", *Word* 15: 313–24.
1960a *Le iscrizioni minoiche* (Firenze: Valmartina).
1960b "Struktura i jazyk minojskix nadpisej" [The structure and the language of the Minoan inscriptions], *VJa* 3: 17–27.
- Petruševski, M. D.
1966 "ΓΑΛΛΑΔΡΑ = ΧΑΡΑΔΡΑ", *ŽAnt* 16.310.
- Philippson, A.
1905 "Epeiros (Geographie)", in PAULY – WISSOWA (1894– 5.2 [= Halbband 10]: 2718–23).
- Pisani, V.
1937a "Il problema illirico", *Pannonia* 3: 276–90.
1937b "La posizione linguistica del macedone", *Revue internationale des études balkaniques* 1.5: 8–31.
1964 "Les origines de la langue albanaise", *SAlb* 1: 61–8.
- Poghirc, C.
1960 "Considérations sur le lexique de l'ancien macédonien", *RRL* 5: 135–45.
1963 "L'alternance m/mb/b en thrace et en albanais", *BalkE* 6: 97–100.
1967 "Considérations sur les éléments autochtones de la langue roumaine", *RRL* 12: 19–36.
- Pokorny, J.
1938 *Zur Urgeschichte der Kelten und Illyrier* (Halle: Max Niemeyer).
- Popović, I.
1958 "Slaven und Albaner in Albanien und Montenegro – zum Problem der slavisch-albanischen Sprachchronologie", *ZSlPh* 26: 301–24.
1959 "Bemerkungen über die vorslavischen Ortsnamen in Serbien", *ZSlPh* 28: 101–14.
1960 *Geschichte der serbokroatischen Sprache* (= *Bibliotheca slavica*) (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- Pott, A. F.
1853 *Die Personennamen* (Leipzig: Brockhaus).
- Pudić, I.
1966–67 "Staromakedonski jezik" [The language of the ancient Macedo-

- nians], *GABiH* 4 (= *Centar za balkan ispitivanja* 2): 5–25; 5 (= 3): 145–50.
- Reichenkron, G.
1966 *Das Dakische* (Heldelberg: Winter).
- Rendić-Miočević, D.
1948 *Ilirska onomastika na latinskim natpisima Dalmacije* [Illyrian onomastics on Latin inscriptions from Dalmatia] (= *Prilog Vjesniku za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* 52.3) (Split: Štamparija Slobodna Dalmacija).
1949 "Prilog proučavanju naše ranosredovječne onomastike" [Contribution to the study of our early-medieval onomastics], *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 3.1: 9–21.
1951a "Onomastička pitanja sa teritorija ilirskih Dalmata" [Onomastic problems from the territory of the Delmatae], *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja u Sarajevu, nova serija* 6: 33–48.
1951b "Novi ilirski epigrafički spomenici iz Ridera (Municipium Ridentarum)" [New Illyrian epigraphic monuments from Rider (Municipium Ridentarum)], *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja u Sarajevu, nova serija* 6: 49–64.
1952 "Iliri u natpisima grčkih kolonija u Dalmaciji" [Illyrians on the inscriptions of Greek colonies in Dalmatia], *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* 53: 25–57.
1953 "Novi epigrafički prilozii ilirskoj onomastici sa teritorija Dalmata" [New epigraphic contributions to the Illyrian onomastics from the territory of the Delmatae], *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* 33: 245–54.
1955 "Onomastičke studije sa teritorije Liburna" [Onomastic studies from the territory of the Liburnians], *Zbornik Instituta za historijske nauke u Zadru* 1: 125–45.
1956 "Illyrica; zum Problem der illyrischen onomastischen Formel in römischer Zeit", *Archaeologia Iugoslavica* 2: 39–51.
1960–64 "Ilirske onomastičke studije" [Illyrian onomastic studies], *ŽAnt* 10: 143–51; 13–14: 101–10.
1963 "Onomastique illyrienne de la Dalmatie ancienne", in: *AMCISO* 7.3: 273–7.
1966 "Problemi romanizacije Ilira s osobitim obzirom na kultove i onomastiku" [Problems of the Romanization of the Illyrians with special respect to cults and onomastics], in *Simpozijum* (1966: 139–56).
- Rix, H.
1963 "Etruskisch (seit 1951)", *Kratylos* 8: 113–58.
1968 "Eine morphosyntaktische Übereinstimmung zwischen Etruskisch und Lemnisch: die Datierungsformel", in: *Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft und Kulturkunde; Gedenkschrift für Wilhelm Brandenstein (1898–1967)* (Ed.: M. Mayrhofer et alii) (= *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft* 14) (Innsbruck: Gesellschaft zur Pflege der Geisteswissenschaften), pp. 213–22.

Roglić, J.

- 1970 "Die Gebirge als die Wiege des geschichtlichen Geschehens in Süd-osteuroopa", in: *Argumenta geographica; Festschrift Karl Troll zum 70. Geburtstag* (24. Dezember 1969) (= *Colloquium geographicum* 12) (Berlin: Dümmler), pp. 225–39.

Rosén, H.

- 1954 "The stele of Lemnos, its text and alphabetic system", *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 1: 1–21.

Ruge, W.

- 1941 "Phrygia (Topographie)", in PAULY – WISSOWA (1894–20 [= Halbband 39]: 781–868).

Russu, I. I.

- 1938 "Macedonica", *Ephemeris Dacoromana* 8: 1–128. [in Italian]
 1941–43 "Granița etnică între traci și illiri" [The ethnic border between Thracians and Illyrians], *Anuarul Institutului de studii clasice* 4: 73–147.
 1941–48 "Onomasticon Daciae", *Anuarul Institutului de studii clasice* 4 (1941–43): 207–22; 5 (1944–48): 282–95.
 1959 *Limba traco-dacilor* [The language of the Thraco-Dacians] (București: Editura Academiei). [2nd edition: (1964); cf. Russu (1969a)]
 1969a *Die Sprache der Thrako-Daker* (București: Editura Științifică). [= translation of Russu (1959)]
 1969b *Illirii; istoria – limba și onomastica – romanizarea* [The Illyrians; history – language and onomastics – the Romanization] (București: Editura Academiei).
 1970 *Elemente autohtone în limba română; substratul comun româno-albanez* [Autochthonous elements in the Rumanian language; the common Rumano-Albanian substratum] (București: Editura Academiei).

Šalabalić, R.

- 1967 "Eine umbrisch-etruskische Inschrift aus Bosnien (Pod bei Bugojno)", *Archaeologia Jugoslavica* 8: 35–45.

Salonius, Aarne Henrik

- 1911 *De dialectis Epirotarum, Aetolorum, Acarnanum, Aenianum, Phthiotarum* (Helsingfors: Heredum J. Simelius).
 1915 *Varia de origine et sermone tabularum Dodonae effossarum* (= *Kertomus Viipurin Klassillisen lyseon, Toiminnasta Lukuvuonna 1914–1915* (Ed. Antti Helander)) (Helsingfors: J. Simelius).

Šašel, J.

- 1964 "Probleme und Möglichkeiten onomastischer Forschung", in: *Akten des 4. internationalen Kongresses für griechische und lateinische Epigraphik* (Wien: Böhlau), pp. 352–68.

Schachermeyr, F.

- 1929 *Etruskische Frühgeschichte* (Berlin – Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter).
 1935 *Hethiter und Achäer* (= *Mitteilungen der Deutschen orientalischen Gesellschaft* 9) (Leipzig: Harrassowitz).
 1950 in: *The languages of the Minoan Mycenaean civilizations*, mid-century report New Year 1950 (Ed.: G. F. Ventris) (London – New York: Michael Ventris).

- 1954 "Prähistorische Kulturen Griechenlands", in PAULY – WISSOWA (1894–) 22 [= Halbband 44]: 1350–548.

1955 *Die ältesten Kulturen Griechenlands* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).

- 1958 "Zur Frage der Lokalisierung von Achiawa", in: *Minoica; Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Johannes Sundwall* (Ed.: E. Grumach) (= *Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft* 12) (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag), pp. 365–80.

- 1962 "Luwier auf Kreta?", *Kadmos* 1: 27–39.

Scherer, A.

- 1965 "Fremdsprachige Personennamen im alten Griechenland", in: *Symbolae linguisticae in honorem Georgii Kurylowicz* (Red.: Adam Heinz et alii) (= *Polska Akademia Nauk, Oddział w Krakowie, Prace komisji Językoznawstwa* 5) (Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków: Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk), pp. 255–64.

Schmid, W. P.

- 1968 *Alteuropäisch und Indogermanisch* (= *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse* 6) (Wiesbaden: Steiner).

Schmidt, H.

- 1894 *Epeirotika* (Marburg: O. Ehrhardt). [dissertation; in German]

Schütt, C.

- 1910 *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der alten Illyrier* (Breslau: Theiner und Meinicke).

Schulze, W.

- 1904 *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (= *Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse* 5) (Göttingen: Weidmann).

Schwyzer, E.

- 1939 *Griechische Grammatik* 1 (München: Beck).

Ševoroškin, V. V.

- 1962 "Karijskij vopros" [The Carian problem], *VJa* 5: 93–100.

- 1964 "Zur karischen Schrift und Sprache", *Kadmos* 3: 72–87.

- 1965 *Issledovanija po dešifrovke karijskix nadpisej* [Investigations on the decipherment of the Carian inscriptions] (Moskva: Nauka).

Simeonov, B.

- 1963 "Noms de lieux thraces récemment découverts", *BalkE* 6: 87–92.

Simone, C. de

- 1964 "Die messapischen Inschriften", in: KRAHE (1955–64 2: 1–151, 233–61).

Simpozijum

- 1964 *Simpozijum o teritorijalnom i hronološkom razgraničenju Ilira u praito-rijsko doba održan 15. i 16. maja* [Symposium on the territorial and chronological development of the Illyrians in prehistoric times, held May 15–16] (= *Posebna izdanja Naučnoga društva SRBosne i Hercegovine* 4) (Ed.: A. Benac) (Sarajevo).

- 1966 *Simpozijum o Ilirima u antičko doba održan 10. do 12. maja 1966. godine* [Symposium on the Illyrians in antiquity, held May 10–12,

- 1966) (= *Posebna izdanja Akademije nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine* 5) (Ed.: A. Benac) (Sarajevo 1967).
- 1968 *Simpozijum: Predslavenski etnički elementi na Balkanu u etnogenezi južnih Slovena održan 24.-26. oktobra u Mostaru* [Symposium: Pre-Slavic ethnic elements in the Balkans and the ethnogenesis of the South-Slavs, held October 24-26 in Mostar] (= *Posebna izdanja Akademije nauka i umjetnosti* 12) (Ed.: A. Benac) (Sarajevo 1969).
- Sittig, E.
1924 "Zur neu gefundenen kyprischen Sprache", *KZ* 52: 194-202.
- Šofman, A. S.
1960 *Istorija antičnoj Makedonii* 1 [History of ancient Macedonia] (Kazan': University Press).
- Solmsen, F.
1907 Review of HOFFMANN (1906), *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 27: 270-5.
- Sommer, F.
1932 *Die Ahhijawa-Urkunden* (= *Abhandlungen der bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Abteilung, neue Folge* 6) (München: Beck).
1934 *Ahhijavāfrage und Sprachwissenschaft* (= *Abhandlungen der bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Abteilung, neue Folge* 9) (München: Beck).
1937 "Ahhijawa und kein Ende?", *IF* 55: 169-297.
- Stipčević, A.
1966 *Gli Illiri* (Milano: Il Saggiatore).
1967 *Bibliographia Illyrica* (= *Posebno izdanje Akademije nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine* 6) (Sarajevo: Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine).
- Sturz, Fr. W.
1808 *De dialecto Macedonica et Alexandrina* (Leipzig: Weigl).
- Suić, M.
1955a "Istočna jadranska obala u Pseudo Skilakovu Periplusu" [The eastern Adriatic shore in the Periplus of Pseudo-Scylax], *RadJA* 306: 121-85.
1955b "Granice Liburnije kroz stoljeća" [The borders of Liburnia through centuries], *Radovi Instituta za historijske nauke u Zadru* 2: 273-96.
1966a "Zapadne granice Ilira u svjetlu historijskih izvora" [The western borders of the Illyrians in the light of the historical sources], in *Simpozijum* (1966: 33-53).
1966b "Nekoliko etnoloških podataka o antičkim Ilirima u djelima grčkih i rimskih pisaca" [Some ethnological data about the ancient Illyrians in the works of Greek and Roman authors], in *Simpozijum* (1966: 99-110).
- Svoronos, J. I.
1919 *Hellénisme primitif de la Macédonie* (Paris: E. Leroux).
- Thomopoulos, I.
1912 *Pelasgiká* 1 (Athēnai: D. Roku). [vol. 2: (1933)]
- Thraemer, E.
1888 *Pergamos* (Leipzig: Teubner).

- Thumb, A.
1909 "Altgriechische Elemente im Albanesischen", *IF* 26: 1-20.
1907 Review of HOFFMANN (1906), *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur* 10.19: 76-8.
- Thumb, A. - E. Kieckers
1932 *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte* 1² (Heidelberg: Winter). [1st edition: (1909)]
- Thumb, A. - A. Scherer
1959 *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte* 2² (Heidelberg: Winter). [1st edition: (1909)]
- Titov, V. S.
1969 *Neolit Grecii; periodizacija i xronologija* [The Neolithic of Greece; periodization and chronology] (Moskva: Nauka).
- Tjumenev, A. I.
1953 "K voprosu ob etnogeneze grečeskogo naroda" [On the ethnogenesis of the Greeks], *Vestnik drevnej istorii* 4: 19-46.
- Tomaschek, W.
1892 "Die Urbevölkerung von Kleinasien", *Mitteilungen der Wiener anthropologischen Gesellschaft, Sitzungsberichte* 22: 1-4.
1893-94 *Die alten Thraker; eine ethnologische Untersuchung* (= *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, philosophisch-historische Klasse* 128. 4 (1893), 130. 2 (1893), 131.1 (1894)) (Wien: Tempsky).
- Torp, A.
1904 *Die vorgriechische Inschrift von Lemnos* (Christiania: J. Dybwad).
- Treidler, H.
1917 *Epirus im Altertum* (Leipzig). [unpublished dissertation]
- Trombetti, A.
1926 "Saggio di onomastica mediterranea", *Arhiv za arbanasku starinu, jezik i etnologiju* 3: 1-116.
1942 *Saggio di antica onomastica mediterranea* (Firenze: Rinascimento del libro).
- Untermann, J.
1961 *Die venetischen Personennamen*, 2 vol. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
1964 "Die messapischen Personennamen", in *KRAHE* (1955-64 2: 153-229).
1970 "Venetisches in Dalmatien", *GABiH* 6: 5-21.
- Vasmer, M.
1908 "K voprosu o jazyke drevnej Makedonii" [On the question of the language of ancient Macedonia], *Žurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosvješćenija, Otdel klassičeskoj filologii* 1908: 22-35.
- Ventris, M. - J. Chadwick
1956 *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, with a foreword by A. J. B. Wace (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Vlahov, K.
1963 "Nachträge und Berichtungen zu den thrakischen Sprachresten und Rückwörterbuch" *GSUF* 57.2: 219-372.
1965 "Zur Frage der Gräzisierung thrakischer Personennamen", *ŽAnt* 15: 39-44.

- 1966a "Die Vertretung der indo-europäischen *a* und *e* im Thrakischen", *GSUF* 60: 45–134.
- 1966b "Das thrakische Wort *para* und seine Deutung", *ŽAnt* 15: 295–304.
- 1966c "Sind die Wortteile *dokos*, *tokos* u.ä., die in zweistämmigen Personennamen auftreten, thrakisch?", *ŽAnt* 15: 305–19.
- 1968a "Die *l*- und *k*- Suffixe in der thrakischen Personennamenbildung", *GSUF* 62.1: 243–82.
- 1968b "Über die Vokalquantitäten im Thrakischen", in: *Actes du premier congrès international des études balkaniques et sud-est européennes*, Sofia, 26 août – 1 sept. 1966 6: *Linguistique* (Ed.: V. Georgiev et alii) (Sofia: Éditions de l'Académie bulgare des sciences), pp. 485–95.
- 1969 "Trako-slavjanski usporednici" [Thraco-Slavic parallels], *GSUF* 63.1: 173–233.
- Vraciu, A.
1963 "Aktual'nye voprosy izučenija substratnyx èlementov rumynskogo jazyka" [Current questions in the study of the substratum elements of the Rumanian language], *BalkE* 6: 119–32.
- 1964 "Rassuždenija o dako-mizijskom substrate rumynskogo jazyka" [Views on the Daco-Mysian substratum of the Rumanian language], *BalkE* 8: 15–45.
- Vulić, N.
1926 "La nationalité des Péoniens", *Le Musée belge* 30: 107–17.
- Weigand, C.
1927 "Sind die Albaner die Nachkommen der Illyrier oder Thraker?" *Balkan Archiv* 3: 227–51.
- Werner, R.
1969 "Die Phryger und ihre Sprache", *BiOr* 26.3–4: 117b–182b.
- Wiesner, J.
1963 *Die Thraker* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).
- Windekens, A. J. van
1952 *Le pélasgique, essai sur une langue indo-européenne préhellénique* (= *Bibliothèque du Muséon* 29) (Louvain: Publications universitaires – Institut Orientaliste).
- 1954 *Contributions à l'étude de l'onomastique pélasgique* (= *Bibliothèque du Muséon* 35) (Louvain: Publications universitaires).
- 1958 "Homerica et Pelasgica", in: *Minoica; Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Johannes Sundwall* (Ed.: Ernst Grumach) (= *Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Schriften der Sektion für Altertumskunde* 12) (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag), pp. 446–50.
- 1959 "Phonétique des mots grecs d'origine préhellénique", *Phonetica* 3: 209–16.
- 1960 *Études pélasgiques* (= *Bibliothèque du Muséon* 49) (Louvain: Publications universitaires).
- Zafropulo, J.
1964 *Histoire de la Grèce à l'âge du bronze; collection d'études anciennes publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé* (Paris: Paris: Les Belles Lettres; Limoges: Bontemps).

- Zaimov, J.
1963 "Quelques particularités des noms thraces en Bulgarie", *BalkE* 6: 81–6.
- 1969 "Stratigraphie ethnique dans l'hydronymie des Balkans", *DMV* 2: 503–7.
- Zaninović, M.
1966–67 "Ilirsko pleme Delmati" [The Illyrian tribe of the Delmatae], *GABiH* 4: 27–92; 5: 5–101.
- Zippel, G.
1877 *Die römische Herrschaft in Illyrien bis auf Augustus* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Žganjer, B.
1952 "Kelti u Iliriku" [The Celts in Illyricum], *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* 53: 13–23.